4151. d

A VINDICATION OF *Robert Barclay's Apology*

For the PRINCIPLES of the People call'd

QUAKERS;

Againſt the Attempts of

WILLIAM NOTCUT,

In a late *Pamphlet*, Entituled,

An IMPARTIAL REVIEW *of* Robert Barclay's *Pretended* APOLOGY.

In a LETTER to a Friend at *Ipſwich*.

By H. B.

LONDON:
Printed and Sold by the Aſſigns of *J. Sowle*, at the *Bible* in *George-Yard*, *Lombard-ſtreet*: And alſo ſold by the Bookſellers of *London* and *Weſtminſter*.

M, DCC, XXXII.

A VINDICATION

OF

Robert Barclay's Apology

For the PRINCIPLES of the People called

QUAKERS;

Against the Calumnies of

WILLIAM NOTCUT,

In a late Pamphlet, Entituled,

The IMPARTIAL REVIEW of Robert Barclay's Pretended APOLOGY.

In a LETTER to a Friend at Aylesford.

By H. B.

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle, at the Bible in Gracechurch-street, Leonard-street: And also Sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster.

M,DCC,XXXII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A VINDICATION OF *Robert Barclay's Apology, &c.*

I HAVE read over the Book which was ſent me, publiſhed by *William Notcut*, againſt *Robert Barclay's Apology* for the Principles of the *Quakers*: And as it appears to me, he has not treated R. B. with that Impartiality which is becoming a Chriſtian, and what he gave us to expect in his Title Page; I have thought proper to take upon me the Vindication of that great and good Man, whoſe Writings have merited the Publick Applauſe and Commendation of divers ingenious Men, as being a Conſiſtent and * Maſterly Performance, founded on the Authority of the ſacred Writings of the Scriptures, and ſupported by the Opinions of famous Authors, both ancient and modern.

* The Author of the *Britiſh Journal* ſays, 'I am not 'aſhamed to own, that I have with great Pleaſure read over

An attempt on such a Performance cannot make a very agreeable Figure in the World, except maintained with ſtrong Reaſoning, juſt Diſtinctions, and a ſtrict Regard to Truth, in producing Quotations from him; and as a common requiſite to put the beſt rather than the worſt Conſtruction on any Paſſage that may not be clearly apprehended.

And theſe ought the more to be obſerved, when the Author is deceaſed, and therefore cannot appear to his own Vindication; but a contrary Practice is a great Violation of the Laws of Juſtice and Humanity, an Affront to common Senſe, and an abuſe upon the Reader: It gives People wrong Apprehenſions of his Writings, and ſtamps Reproach on his Memory; unleſs ſome, who ſee the ill Treatment, riſe up and vindicate the injur'd Dead.

R. B.

' over Mr. *Barclay's Apology for Quakeriſm*, and do really ' think it to be the moſt Maſterly, Charitable and Rea- ' ſonable Syſtem that I have ever ſeen; it ſolves the nu- ' merous Difficulties raiſed by other Sects, and by Turns ' thrown at one another; he ſhews all the Parts of Scrip- ' ture to be Uniform and Conſiſtent, and comprehends ' every Thing which has been ſince ſaid by the beſt ' Writers for Liberty of Conſcience, and againſt all Sorts ' of Religious Impoſitions, with as much Wit, happy ' Turn, and Maſterly Expreſſions, as is Conſiſtent with ' the Plainneſs and Simplicity affected by thoſe of his ' Sect, and for the moſt Part uſed in the Holy Writings.'

R. B. could have no particular and ſmiſter Ends, no avaritious Deſires to gratify, in the Writing his *Apology*; his Soul was above it, and his Circumſtances too. But had not this been the Caſe, the Expectation of Reward would have been vain from a People, whoſe Principles teach them, that the Foundation of all their Services for Religion, is the Duty they owe to their Maker, and a beneficent temper of Mind to their Fellow Creatures; that is, for the Love of their Souls, and the Deſire of their Welfare, they are concerned to point out that which they believe to be the right Way to Happineſs. And as this (I am perſuaded) was the Caſe with *R. B.* in writing his Apology; ſo his Memory merits a Treatment equal to his good Deſign, but at leaſt not an injurious one.

William Notcut freely acknowledges the Reaſon of Writing his Review, which was not for the ſake of *Tho. Dewey*, who by his Account was not worth ſeeking after.*

For, ſays he, *If he had thought good to go off alone, I aſſure you, I had never medled with him, nor*

*What he ſays, of *T. D.* his threatning to burn any Thing of this Nature that ſhould to be wrote him: I am credibly inform'd, that in this *W. N.* hath impoſed on his Reader, for that *T. D.* declares he never ſaid ſo.

nor with the Quakers *Principles. But as ſoon as I heard that he was enticing young People to follow him, and ſome whom I had the Charge of, I thought it my Duty to let you ſee what a deſperate Step he himſelf has taken.*

THESE are the weighty Reaſons which have engaged *W. N.* to write a Review of *R. B's* Apology. But had it not been, that he was likely to have loſt ſome of his Hearers, and conſequently his Income leſſened, the *Quakers* might have reſted ſecure in the Enjoyment of their ſuppoſed Hereſies, without any Moleſtation from him. But is this a Manifeſtation of the Chriſtian Regard he has for Men, whom he ſuppoſes are deluded and miſtaken, that he had never attempted a Refutation of their Errors, nor ſought their Convincement, had it not been for the loſs of ſome of his Auditory?

THE way he has taken to ſhew his Diſſatisfaction, is, to leſſen, as much as he can, the Reputation of the beforementioned Apology, which it is likely, he might think, would be an Addition to his Reputation, and make him look ſomething more conſiderable to attack ſo great an Author; whom abundance of Men of Learning and

and Parts have not thought proper to meddle with*.

W. N. tells his Reader, *p.* 5. *That* R. B. *has not been ſo honeſt as to ſhew, wherein many others of their approved Writers have differed from himſelf, and that he did not pretend to Vindicate, or make Apology, for all that has been written by any Man or Men that have gone before him, by the Name* Quaker.

And this Taſk he would have impoſed on *R. B.* and have made him accountable for the Writings of every Author that has writ as a *Quaker* before him; otherwiſe, he concludes, he has not done honeſtly in writing an Apology for the Principles of the *Quakers*.

A Task

* *John Norris*, a *Clergyman*, ſays, 'I cannot think *Quakeriſm* ſo inconſiderable, as the Principles of it are laid down, and managed by Mr. *Barclay*.

'That great and general Contempt they lie under, does not hinder me from thinking the Sect of the *Quakers* to be by far the moſt conſiderable of any that divide from the Church, in caſe the *Quakeriſm* that is generally held, be the ſame with that which Mr. *Barclay* has delivered to the World as ſuch; whom I take to be ſo great a Man, that were it not for the common Prejudice that lies againſt him, as being a *Quaker*, he would be ſure not to fail of the Character of one of the greateſt Wits of the Age: And I profeſs freely, I had rather engage againſt an hundred *Bellarmins*, *Hardings*, and *Stapletons*, than with one *BARCLAY*.

A Task, I confeſs, that one would have little expected from an Underſtanding, capable to review ſo rational a Syſtem as *R. B*'s. For what has a Man, who writes an Apology for the Principles of a Society, to do with the Writings of private Perſons? Societies are accountable for what they publiſh as their Principles, and private Perſons for themſelves; and the ſame with reſpect to Practices: And neither the Principles nor Practices of any private Perſon, ought to be attributed to a Society, except thoſe Principles or Practices are avowed by them. So that, ſuppoſe a Perſon had odd Notions, and bad Practices; muſt a Society, or an Author, who writes an Apology for that Society, vindicate or apologize for thoſe Principles and Practices of that particular Perſon, or elſe come under the Character of acting diſhoneſtly? This, I conclude, *W. N.* will not allow, if applied to himſelf, or his own Society. *Eliſha Cole* wrote a Syſtem of particular Election, ſuppoſed by ſome, to be a Maſter Piece for that Opinion; and by others, an abſurd, weak Performance. If any of his Society had (before him) writ contrary to his Syſtem, or taken a different Method to maintain his Opinion, or any of *Eliſha Cole*'s Brethren had ſlipt, and he had not vindicated one, and accounted or apologized for the other; he, according to *W. N*'s Reaſoning, muſt come under the Notion of acting diſhoneſtly; and the ſame

with

with respect to the Church of *England*, and most dissenting Societies from it: As there are Diversities of Opinions among the Members of each Society, even about Matters which they judge regards Salvation; what Contests and Disputes have arisen and been carried on, in which there has been as contrary Positions and Vindications as Light to Darkness? And alike have been, and are their Practices. Now if any Person in either of these Societies should take upon him to write an Apology for their Principles, unless he vindicates the Writings of those who have gone before him, and account or apologize for their Practices he must according to *W. N.* come under the Notion of acting dishonestly. The Reasonableness of which, I leave to the Readers Judgment.

But to carry on his Resentment, he says, *Not a Word of their Blasphemy against Christ and his Word.* This I must beg leave to say, is a high Abuse, and looks to me, as if he did not value what he said, so he could answer his End of effectually prejudicing People against the *Quakers* in general, and *R. B*'s Apology in particular. But will Men of Judgment receive so dogmatical an Assertion without Proof, surely no; and unless he doth prove it, he cannot be looked upon otherwise than an unjust Calumniator.

BUT could not I with more Juſtice return on him, and tell him, that the Doctrine of particular Election is by many, judged to be an abſurd uncharitable, nay, blaſphemous Doctrine; would he think that a bare Aſſertion ſhould be received, would he think it was acting fairly or like Diſputant. Let him apply this to himſelf, and I apprehend he will plainly ſee, how unſafe it is to reproach other Peoples Principles, when his own are liable to ſuch great Objections.

IN his firſt Chapter he attempts to give the Original of the Name *Quaker*: In doing which, I wiſh I could ſay he did not manifeſt a Temper of Mind too much like the People who firſt gave that Name by way of Contempt, and too much like the Spirit that raigned formerly in *New England*. *

BUT as to the Cauſe of this Name being given which he ſays, *was from their Trembling*, it may be,

---

* 'The Spirit that reigned in *New England*, was a 'Spirit of Perſecution, and to ſuch a Height was it grown, 'that *William Robinſon*, Merchant of *London*, *Marmaduke* 'Stevenſon, *William Leddra*, and *Mary Dyer*, were all put to 'Death, for bearing Teſtimony to the Truth as profeſſed 'by the People called *Quakers*, and many others cruelly 'perſecuted, as more fully appears by *George Biſhop*'s Book 'intituled *New England Judged*. And *William Sewell*'s 'Hiſtory of the *Quakers*, p. 276, 277.

be, he is unacquainted with the Operation of the Spirit in the Work of Regeneration, which ſometimes may appear by ſuch viſible Effects, and to affix any ignominious Character to an Effect of ſuch Operations is not very conſiſtent with a Chriſtian, nor ſhews an Acquaintance with the working of the Grace of God upon the Mind.

Nor can it be a Juſtification of *W. N.* to rake in the irreligious and unmanly Treatment of the Enemies and Perſecutors of this innocent People, and fling it at them at this Time, But muſt be an Evidence of exceeding Prejudice and Reſentment: For otherwiſe, a little ſearching the Scriptures would have furniſhed him with Inſtances of Perſons who were made to tremble in divers Caſes and at different Times, to whom as properly the Word *Quaker* might be as juſtly applied as to this People, a few of which Inſtances I ſhall produce. Iſa. lxvi. 5. *Hear the Word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his Word,* Jer. x. 10. *At his Wrath the Earth ſhall tremble.* Hab. iii. 16. *When I heard my Belly trembled, my Lips quivered at the Voice.* Acts vii. 32. *Then* Moſes *trembled,* Acts xxiv. 25. *Felix trembled.* Pſal. ii. 11. *Serve the Lord with Fear and rejoice with Trembling.* Luke viii. 47. *And when the Woman ſaw ſhe was not hid, ſhe came trembling.* Luke viii. 47. *Work out your own Salvation*

with Fear and Trembling. 1 Cor. ii. 3. *I was with you in Weariness, in Fear, and in much Trembling.*

Now it is evident from these Texts and many others, that there were People who trembled in former Ages. And will any one pretend to assert, that because they trembled that it is a good Foundation to affix any ignominious Character to them as a Name of Distinction. But if so, then I see no Reason, why they should not be called *Quakers* as well as the People now distinguished by that Name: For according to *W. N*'s Observation it will stand thus,

Because they trembled.
Therefore they must be called *Quakers*.
Moses and *Felix* trembled
Therefore they must be called *Quakers*, and so with Respect to the rest, nay, even to *W. N.* himself, if he works out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling.

And so it will stand thus,
W. N. Works out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling,
Therefore *W. N.* is a *Quaker*.

I see no Way to evade these Conclusions, for *W. N.* doth not, nor cannot shew any better Reason

ſon for that Name of Reproach being given, than what has been obſerved, and whenever, and in whomſoever the ſame Effects appear, there is equally the ſame Reaſon to give that Name.

That firſt of this Society diſtinguiſhed by their Enemies, by the Name Quaker, *W. N.* ſays, *were James Naylor* and *George Fox*, which I ſhall not diſpute, as to that particular Name; but not the firſt with reſpect to the Principles of that Society, for they are as ancient as the Doctrines which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles delivered perſonally to the World: *James Naylor W. N.* ſays, gave out, that he was the very Chriſt, and this Aſſertion I ſhould have been ſurprized at, had not I met with divers others of no better Authority and unſupported as to any Proof: Nor do I apprehend he can prove any ſuch Thing from any Authentic Hiſtory or Writing, ſo that I muſt beg leave to enter a Caveat againſt his bare Aſſertion.

That there were ſome Enthuſiaſtick Actions performed by certain Perſons, through a blind Zeal, and an unwarrantable Affection to *James Naylor*; and that he might not reprove them as he ought to have done, I ſhall not deny: But, ſhall the Actions of a few miſguided Zealots, and the Indulgence of him, to whom thoſe Actions were performed, be laid to the Charge of a Society who

who were not concerned, nor did ever countenance such extravagant Performances; but on the contrary shewed the utmost Dislike and Abhorrence to such Practices: were not this allow'd as a sufficient Apology for the Society now under Consideration, what strange Confusion and Perplexities of accounting would Societies be plunged into, if they must answer for the Faults and Errors of every Person, who pretends Membership to that Society: But to shew how unfair and ungenerous it is to asperse the Memory of the Dead, when he had given such an evident Proof of Repentance of his Error and Delusion; I have produced his Recantation and Submission, which is done in such strong Terms, that the greatest of his Enemies must acknowledge, that he did all in his Power to attone here for the Fault which in the Respect before mentioned he had committed.

'But condemned for ever be all those false 'Worships, with which any have idoliz'd my 'Person, in the Night of my Temptation, 'when the Power of Darkness was above, all 'their casting of their Cloths in the way; their 'Bowings and Singings, and all the rest of those 'wild Actions which did any way dishonour the 'Lord; all that I condemn, by which the pure 'Name of God hath been blasphemed through 'me, in the Time of Temptation; this Offence 'I con-

*Letter to the Bishop of *Lichfield*.

'I confess, which hath been Sorrow of Heart,
'that the Enemy of Man's Peace in Christ, should
'get this Advantage in the Night of my Trial;
'and all those wild ranting Spirits, I which then
'gathered about me in that Time of Darkness,
'and all their wild Actions and wicked Words a-
'gainst the Honour of God, and his pure Spirit;
'and People, I deny that bad Spirit, the Power
'and Works thereof, and as far as I gave Ad-
'vantage through want of Judgment, for that
'evil Spirit in any to arise, I take Shame to my-
'self justly; and if the Lord of all my Mercies,
'had not rescued me, I had perished; for I was
'as one appointed to Death and Destruction; and
'it is in my Heart to confess to God, and before
'Men, my Folly and Offence in that Day.'
I have made an Abridgment, but the *Reader* may see it at large in *W. Sewel's* History of the *Quakers*.

From the Instance of *James Naylor*, *W. N.* makes it no Difficulty to declare, *Thus their Beginning was Blasphemy*; but how unjust this Conclusion is I have already shewn, and a Man of not so much Figure as *W. N.* must see it a weak Inference; that if one Person of a Society had been proved guilty of Blasphemy, that therefore the Beginning of that Society was with Blasphemy; is so unnatural and forced a Construction, that I cannot help determining it proceeded more from

Prejudice

Prejudice than in the Courſe of Reaſoning; (and more eſpecially, when *James Nayler* was not one of the firſt, and his, and his Followers Actions diſown'd, as I have before obſerv'd:) And as a farther Evidence of this, he ſays, George Fox *alſo gave out that he was Chriſt.*

THIS I confeſs is the firſt Charge of that Kind on *George Fox* that ever I met with; and I think *W. N.* cannot do Juſtice to *G. F.*'s Memory, without he proves, or publickly retracts the Charge; for this is uſing the Dead in a very extraordinary Manner, and taking Liberty to ſay of them what he pleaſes: Certain I am, there is not the leaſt Inſtance can be produced for any ſuch Aſſertion; and therefore, unleſs *W. N.* doth prove what he hath aſſerted, he cannot be looked on otherwiſe, than caſting unjuſt Reflections on the Dead, and impoſing on his Readers on purpoſe to prejudice them againſt the *Quakers*.

BUT to ſhew the contrary of his Aſſertion, I have here produced ſome of *G. Fox*'s own Words; and can it be ſuppoſed, he would declare in ſuch a manner, and at the ſame Time, give out that himſelf was the Chriſt.

"THIS Jeſus hath God raiſed up, and we "the People of God, in Scorn called *Quakers*, do

ſay

'say, that there is no Salvation in any other 'Name under Heaven, whereby Men must be 'saved, but in the Name of Jesus Christ of *Naza-* 'reth, which was crucified without the Gates of 'Jerusalem, whom God hath raised from the 'Dead.'*

WITH what Front then, can the Reviewer stand up in the Face of the Country, and assert that this very Man gave out he was Christ; when no Person could be more averse to any such Pretensions, nor have left stronger Evidences behind him: the Quotation before must be admitted for him, he declaring expressly, that there is no Salvation but by Jesus of *Nazareth*.

CHARITY leads me to think, that had *W. N.* rightly considered this matter, he had more Sense and Regard to Truth, than to have asserted any such Thing, but sometimes it may happen, that our private Prejudices may run so high, as in some measure to dim our Perception. †

WHAT *W. N.* means by *two of a Trade cannot agree*, he best knows, for my Part, I do not appre-

* *G. Fox's Doctrinals*, p. 417.

† His frothy Observation of *J. Naylor's* calling *G. Fox* Devil, and *G. Fox* calling *Naylor* Devil, I return as a base Rule; and provoke him to Proof thereof in his next.

hend, that the before-mentioned Aſſertions of *W. N.* reſpecting *G. F.* and *J. N.* did regard any Trade to be carried on; I do not conceive they promoted their Principles by the means, or on the ſame Foundation that *W. N.* doth; Trade is to get Money by, and if it be a juſt Inference, that whatſoever a Man gets Money by, or makes it his Living, that that is a Trade, then it ſeems very likely, that this Coat better fits *W. N.* than it doth *G. F.* or *J. N.*

He proceeds in the 8th Page of his *Review* to the Proof of the Occaſion of the Name *Quaker*, in which his Succeſs is equal to the foregoing, he produces ſome Paſſages out of *W. Smith's Primmer*, which whether truly quoted or not, I cannot ſay, nor do I think it neceſſary to examine, they being no Principles or Points of Doctrine; and therefore if they are trifling Queſtions, and the Author of the Verſes, a trifling Grammar-Scholar; the Obſervator may, for ought I know, by ſome Readers be ranked together, which is what I think is neceſſary to be ſaid thereon:

W. N. quotes *R. B* page 359: ſetting forth the Operation of the Spirit of God upon the Soul, that *it may be compared to a painful Travail through the different Seeds that may ſhake the Body, and fill not only one Perſon, but a whole Aſſembly with Groanings.* On which *W. N.* obſerves, that *Impreſſions on the Mind*

Mind may occaſion Trembling in a ſingle Body, as in the Caſe of Belſhazzer, *yet how the Spirit's Work upon one Soul, ſhould occaſion Groanings through the whole Aſſembly, is ſuch a Myſtery I cannot account for.*

THE firſt Part of this Quotation, there is no Difference between *W. N.* and *R. B.* for that the former allowes, Impreſſions on the Mind may occaſion Trembling in a ſingle Body: So that the only matter now remaining as a *Myſtery* to *W. N.* (which is of his own making) is, *how the Spirit's Work on one Soul, ſhould occaſion Groaning thro' the whole Aſſembly.*

WHICH *R. B.* doth not aſſert; He ſaith thus, 'And this not only as to one, but when the Enemy (who when the Children of God aſſemble together, is not wanting to be preſent, to ſee if he can let their Comfort) hath prevailed in any meaſure in a whole Meeting, and ſtrongly worketh againſt it, by ſpreading and propagating his dark Power, and by drawing out the Minds of ſuch as are met from the Life in them, as they come to be ſenſible of this Power of his, that works againſt them, and to wreſtle with it by the Armour of Light; ſometimes the Power of God will break forth into a whole Meeting, and there will be ſuch an inward Travail, while

'each is ſeeking to overcome the Evil in them
'ſelves, that by the ſtrong contrary Workings
'of theſe oppoſite Powers, (like the going of two
'contrary Tides) every individual will be ſtrong-
'ly exerciſed as in a Day of Battail; and thereby
'Trembling, and a Motion of Body will be upon
'moſt, if not upon all.'

I have tranſcribed this Paragraph, to ſhew that *R. B.* doth not aſſert what *W. N.* ſuggeſted, of which he has made ſuch *a Myſtery that he cannot account for*; that the Effect on a whole Aſſembly is occaſioned by the Spirit's working upon one Soul; and therefore as *W. N.* hath allowed, Impreſſions on the Mind may occaſion Trembling in a ſingle Body.

THE ſame may be pleaded in ſeveral Individuals, where each have the like Impreſſions, and conſequently a whole Aſſembly, which is what is aſſerted by *R. B.* and muſt naturally cauſe the Conceſſion of *W. N.* unleſs he ſhall be pleaſed to make no Myſtery of receding from what he has allowed touching this Point.

IN the ſecond Chapter of the Review, the Author repreſents the *Quakers* as a People who do not pay an equal Regard to the holy Scriptures; But that they endeavour to draw Men from a Belief of them, and prefer ſome of their own Writings

tings to them; on which I cannot help obſerving, that I think it ſomething very extraordinary, that *W. N.* ſhould ſpend ſo much Time, and waſte Ink and Paper, in attempting to impoſe Opinions on a Society, which they never did nor can hold, according to the Nature and Deſign of their avowed Principles: For to deny the Scriptures as the only fit outward Rule, or to leſſen their Authority; and at the ſame Time, recur to them for the Probation of ſuch a Fundamental Point of their Doctrine, as the *Light or Manifeſtation of the Spirit of Chriſt within Men*; and divers others which they plead for and ſupport by the Authority of Scripture; would be ſo inconſiſtent and contradictory, as is ſcarcely to be found, except in ſuch like Performances as the *modern Review*.

In this Chapter the Author has inſinuated, that the *Quakers* deny the Scriptures *to be a Rule of Faith, Doctrine, and Converſation*; which is untrue, and contrary to what himſelf has owned in pag. 13. where he ſays, *That* R. Barclay *owns they are a ſecondary Rule.*

And if they allow them (as every one who underſtands their Principles doth) to be a Secondary Rule; conſequently they do not deny them to be a Rule: And on this falſe Foundation he has built his Arguments on this Point; ſo that it were ſufficient

ſufficient to put the Negative in this Caſe; but for the Sake of the Reader, I ſhall ſtate the general Objections againſt the *Quakers* in this Reſpect, and then endeavour to anſwer each Objection.

1. Object. *The* Quakers *ſlight the Holy Scriptures, and will not allow them to be the primary Rule of Faith and Manners.*

2. Object. *That they will not allow the Scriptures to be called the Word of God.*

To the firſt Objection I anſwer, That cannot be true, that they ſlight or diſregard the Scriptures; becauſe as I have before obſerved, it would be demurring to, or leſſening the Authority of that very Book, to whoſe Authority they appeal for the Probation of their known Principles: So that the firſt Part of the Objection can have no Foundation, and the latter Part, I ſee no Reaſon they have to recede from that Opinion, which when conſidered by Men of Reaſon and Religion, will appear no irrational nor unſcriptural Poſition.

R. B's. Apology contains the Principles of the Quakers, notwithſtanding it is againſt *W. N's.* Opinion: And I conclude, that what Book a Society declares contains their Principles, ought to have more Weight than the Negative of their

Oppoſers

Oppoſers; and indeed ſuch a Negative in an Oppoſer as *W. N.* ſeems to indicate that the Doctrines contain'd in *R. B's.* Apology are more Rational and Conſiſtent than what he would willingly Aſſign them, or that the World ſhould know they believe; in ſhort he may ſuppoſe that that Syſtem takes off the Bear-Skin put on them by their Enemies and for fear that the World by means of that Book, ſhould come to a more favourable Opinion, and abate their former Prejudices; he would inſinuate that the Author did not write an *Apology for the Principles of the Quakers, but for his own,* and ſo endeavour to keep Mankind under the ſame Prejudices againſt this People, and continue to Expoſe them to Contempt and Deriſion.

I SAY, take it for granted *R. B's* Syſtem is that of the *Quakers,* and therefore I ſhall produce what he ſays with reſpect to the Scriptures, as neceſſary towards anſwering the latter part of the firſt Objection. Prop. 3. p. 68. 'The former 'Part (ſays *R. B.*) of this Propoſition, tho' it 'needs no Apology for it ſelf, yet it is a good 'Apology for us, and will help to ſweep away 'that among other Calumnies werewith we are 'often loaded, as if we were Vilifiers and Deniers 'of the Scriptures: For in that which we af-'firm of them, it doth appear at what a high

'Rate

'Rate we value them; accounting them (without all Deceit or Equivocation) the moſt excellent Writings in the World, to which, not only no other Writings, are to be preferred but in divers reſpects not comparable thereto. Again Page 71. We do acknowledge the Scriptures to be a very heavenly and divine Writing; the uſe of them to be very comfortable and neceſſary to the Church of Chriſt; and that we alſo give praiſe unto the Lord for his wonderful Providence in preſerving thoſe Writings ſo pure and uncorrupted'.

AGAIN Page 86. 'We do look upon them as the only fit outward Judge of Controverſies among Chriſtians, and that whatſoever Doctrine is contrary unto their Teſtimony, may therfore juſtly be rejected as falſe, and for our Part, we are willing that all our Doctrines and Practices be try'd by them, which we never refuſed, nor ever ſhall in all Controverſies with our Adverſaries as the Judge and Teſt. We ſhall alſo be very willing to admit it as a poſitive certain Maxim; That whatſoever any do, pretending to the Spirit which is contrary to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a Deluſion of the Devil.

By theſe Quotations, is plainly ſeen, what a great Regard and Reverence the *Quakers* pay to the holy Scriptures, and all that *R. B.* or any other of that Society contends for, is the Precedency of the Spirit as the Rule and Guide to Salvation, and
'therefore the Scriptures, not the primary on- Prop. 3.
'ly and principal Rule of Faith and Manners.
'But a Secondary Rule, ſubordinate to the Spi-
'rit, from which they have all their Excellency,
'and Certainty.'

I take it for granted, as the univerſal Conſent of Chriſtians that the Holy Scriptures were wrote by Men, who were inſpired with the Spirit of God; and according to the Apoſtle, 2 *Peter* i. 20. *Moved thereto by the Holy Ghoſt*, and therefore they are called a Revelation of the Mind of God to Mankind. But then what was the Rule before the Scriptures were written? To ſay the World had no Rule, would be to aſſert they acted without Rule, which would be abſurd, the Scriptures could be no Rule till they were in being, which was above two thouſand Years after the Creation of the World; and therefore there muſt be ſomething as a Rule antecedent to the Scriptures, and which they themſelves plentifully ſet forth, was the Spirit of God, and by whoſe Direction and under whoſe Influence they were wrote: And conſequently that muſt be the

primary and principal Rule; to deny this, would be to aſſert that the Thing revealed is antecedent to that which revealed it.

So that the Matter which remains is to ſhew that there are immediate Manifeſtations or Revelations of the Spirit of God; and if this be proved, Then the only Queſtion that can poſſibly ariſe, is, whether the Spirit of Chriſt, by its immediate objective Manifeſtations, be the primary and principal Rule; or whether the Scriptures, which are a mediate Revelation, be the primary and only Rule, and ſo the Manifeſtations of the Spirit ſubordinate to them?

To prove this Matter, that there are immediate Manifeſtations or Revelations of the Spirit of God, I ſhall have Recourſe to the Scriptures and make them the Rule, the only Rule in this Caſe, which I hope will not be unacceptable to *W. N.* though I might appeal to the Practice of the Church of *England*, and other Chriſtians diſſenting therefrom, who all of them according to their ſeveral Cuſtoms pray for the Aſſiſtance of the Spirit to perform the ſeveral Duties of Religion, and if there were no Revelation or Manifeſtation of the Spirit to ſuch Purpoſes, it would be prepoſterous for them to pray for what cannot be ordinarily obtain'd. But as I ſaid before I intend to confine my ſelf to the Scriptures for the

the Probation of the Point now in Queſtion, 1 *Cor.* xii. 7. *But the Manifeſtation of the Spirit is given to every Man to Profit withal.* 1 Cor. ii. 10. *But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit, for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep Things of God.* V. 11. *For what Man knoweth the Things of a Man ſave the Spirit of Man which is in him, even ſo the Things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God.* 1 Cor. xii. 3. *No Man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghoſt.* Matt. xi. 27. *No Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him.*

WERE I to tranſcribe all the Paſſages of Scripture which would tend to the Proof of this Doctrine, I might make that near as big as this Letter, but theſe I have produc'd, I apprehend are ſo very concluſive, I need not trouble my ſelf or the Reader with any more; for by theſe it appears plain, that the Knowledge of the Things of God are not otherwiſe to be obtain'd but by his Spirit, and that no Man can call Jeſus Lord, properly and truly but by the Holy Ghoſt, which muſt be underſtood by the Revelation of the Holy Ghoſt. And laſtly, that the Knowledge of God (expreſsly) is no other way to be obtain'd but by the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, ſo that if the Knowledge of God is neceſſary to every Indivdual

then the Immediate Revelation of that Knowledge is neceſſary to every Individual, which is the Point I attempted to prove.

SEEING then by what I have produc'd from the Holy Scriptures, it appears there are Immediate Manifeſtations or Revelations of the Spirit of God: The only Queſtion that can poſſibly ariſe in the Controverſy about the Scriptures, is, whether the Spirit of Chriſt by its Immediate Objective Manifeſtations, be the Primary and Principal Rule, or whether the Scriptures which are a mediate Revelation, be the primary and only Rule, and ſo the Manifeſtations of the Spirit ſubordinate to them?

AND this, though it may be a Queſtion which naturally flows from the Argument, yet it cannot poſſibly be any Queſtion in it ſelf; and therefore I need not labour to ſet it forth, for to deny the Precedency and Certainty of Immediate Manifeſtations of the Spirit, would threaten the Authority of Mediate Revelation; for tho' it is a mediate Revelation to us, yet it was Immediate Revelation or Inſpiration to thoſe who wrote the holy Scriptures, and therefore to give Precedency to the Scriptures, and make them the primary Rule, would be as bad Logick as this is falſe Philoſophy, to place the Effect before the Cauſe. OUR

Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is the chief Guide and Rule, he declared himſelf, *John* xiv. 6. *I am the Way and the Truth and the Life, no Man cometh unto the Father but by me.* Certainly then he muſt be the Rule who is the Way, and the only Way the Scriptures ſpeak of Chriſt, they direct to him, and therefore he muſt be the Principal Rule, and they, ſubordinate or a ſecondary Rule, and this accords with what Chriſt himſelf farther declared to the *Jews*, *John* v. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal Life, and they are they which teſtify of me, and ye will not come to me that ye might have Life.* *

What can be more expreſs in the favour of the *Quakers* than this? and this is what they mean, when they ſay the Scriptures are not the only and Principal Rule; but that Men muſt come to Chriſt as him by whom eternal Life is to be obtained, and conſequently the aſſerting him to be the principal Rule and Guide to that Salvation which is only to be obtained by him, is not *Slighting* the holy Scriptures or *any Spirit of Deluſion.*

* I would here ask, if the Scriptures are the only Rule, what muſt be the Rule to the greateſt part of the World who have not the Advantage of the Scriptures?

I COME now to anſwer to the ſecond Objection, 'That the *Quakers* will not allow, the Scriptures 'to be called the Word of God', and this a ſmall Portion of Charity and a little Conſideration would have ſaved *W. N.* and others of their Enemies, the Trouble of writing on this Point. Let us then conſider, whether this be a proper Objection in itſelf, not as compared with the Cuſtom or Faſhion of thinking. For Men do not ſeem ſo careful about the Fitneſs and Reaſonableneſs of believing or disbelieving, of owning or diſowning, this Doctrine, or that Cuſtom, but herd together with the Populace of each Society, and are too apt to cenſure others who differ from them, without ever conſidering the Reaſons for or againſt one or the other.

I SAY let us conſider, whether the Objection of the *Quakers*, 'That the Scriptures ought not to 'be called the Word of God,' be a proper Objection, in doing which, it may be expedient to enquire, what we underſtand by that [Word] and here again I recur to the Scriptures, which inform us thus, 1 *John* i. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* v. 14. *And the Word was made, (or took) Fleſh.* Rev. xix. 13. *And he was cloathed with a Veſture dipt in Blood, and his Name was called the Word of God.* By theſe it appears that the [Word] is an

Appellation

Appellation given to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and whatever Appellation is given to him, I conceive, it is not proper to give to any other, and for this Reaſon it is, that the *Quakers* object againſt the Scriptures being called the Word of God, becauſe the [Word] of God is our Lord Chriſt, and is a particular Appellation, as appears by the forecited Scriptures. *

THE Scripture without all Queſtion contain a Revelation of God to Men. But taken conjunctly, how can they be properly called the Word of God, ſeeing, in them are recorded the Words of wicked Men and Devils. I think it reaſonable, that Men ſhould make uſe of Words as they properly relate to Things, and not borrow an Apellation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to adorn the Writings of thoſe whom he had inſpired; he is the divine Λογος, the eternal [Word] and the Scriptures are a mediate Declaration of his Mind, and as ſuch are reverenced and eſteemed by

* I Here obſerve, that the ſeveral Places of Scripture quoted by the Reviewer in p. 13, 14. to prove that the Spirit calls the Bible the Word of God, not one of them doth prove any ſuch Matter, but on the contrary, where the (Word) is mentioned in theſe Places, it expreſly regards the Spirit, neither can in the Nature of the thing be true, reſpecting the Bible taken collectively, ſeeing a conſiderable Part of it was not then wrote.

by the *Quakers*, preferable to all other Writings? according to *R. B.* and are edifying and comfortable to the Church of Chriſt, as they plainly ſet forth the Experiences of good Men, and point out the holy Path they trod.

To ſuppoſe then, that they conſtrue 2 *Pet.* i. 19. *We have a more ſure Word of Prophecy, whereunto you do well to take heed as unto a Light that ſhineth in a dark Place until the Day dawn and the Day Star ariſe in your Hearts*, as *W. N.* hath endeavoured to impoſe, *p.* 11. would be a great abuſe on them, as if they aſſerted, that when the Light is riſen in the Heart, there would be no more need of the Scriptures; and ſo he ſpends near two Pages in fighting with a Man of Straw of his own making; whereas the *Quakers* do not aſſert nor pretend any ſuch Thing, but have equally the ſame Regard for the holy Scriptures, nay the more ſo, as the Light of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ariſes and ſhines in the Heart, it diſcovers the excellent Truths contained in the Scriptures, and as they come to find the ſame Experience in themſelves, as what is related in the Scriptures, it is a Strength and Confirmation to the Believer, and conſequently bring Comfort and Satisfaction: And for the Truth of this, I may appeal to thoſe who have been acquainted with the Shinings of that glorious and divine Light.

WHAT I have here aſſerted with reſpect to the *Quakers*, is evident, by the frequent uſe of the Scriptures in their publick Preaching the Doctrines of Religion, than which no other People have more conſtant recourſe to.

FROM what has been ſaid on this Subject, I apprehend it appears, that the Reaſon why they admit not the Scripture to be called the Word of God, is, becauſe it is giving them the Appellation which is given to Chriſt, when they are only to be underſtood as the Council and Direction of the Spirit of God by an immediate Inſpiration to thoſe holy Men who wrote them.

AND in this Senſe it is, had *G. F.* ſaid What *W. N.* hath quoted from great *Myſtery*, p. 225. *This is the Word of the Lord, the Word of the great God*: And again, *I charge you in the Preſence of the Lord God to ſend this among all the Friends and Brethren, to be read in all Meetings, to you all, this is the Word of the Lord God.* It could not be underſtood that *G. F.* intended any thing more than that it was the Council of God immediately impreſſed on his Mind, and herein I apprehend, that the Prophets are an Example in this Caſe: To ſay, *This is the Word of the Lord*, becauſe it was to them an immediate Revelation of the Word, and whoſoever has ſuch immediate Revelation, has a Right to fol-

low their Example: And thus we find it the Manner of the Prophets. *The Word of the Lord came unto me saying, Thus saith the Word of the Lord.* And herein I conceive *G. F.* would have been defensible for having followed their Example. But neither they, nor him, did say, that the Writings or Message which was sent or delivered, was the Word of God precisely understood: For herein I make a Distinction between the Message sent, and him that sends the Messenger, the Council commanded to be given, and he who immediately dictates and directs the Delivery of it; and therefore *W. N.* may as well fall out with the Prophets as with *G. F.* on the Foundation before observed.

But after all, I do not find, that *G. F.* hath any such Expressions in the Place quoted, for I have carefully searched the Place directed to in *Great Mystery*, and cannot find those Passages. There are indeed at the latter Part of a Paragraph, these Words. *None hath eternal Life, but who comes to the Light within, and the Spirit that was in them that gave the Scriptures forth, And to you, this is the Word of the Lord.*

That is, none can have eternal Life, but who comes to the Spirit of Christ, which is the same which was in the holy Penmen who wrote the Scriptures

Scriptures. 'And to you, this is the Word of the 'Lord,' that is, to you this is the immediate Meſſage or Council of God.

But as a farther Evidence of his ungenerous Papers, he ſays, *R. B.* has ſaid, that *the Bible is a faithful* Hiſtory of things. This ſays *W. N. is a very crafty Deſcription of it, can he commend nothing but the hiſtorical Part, and to call it faithful, is no more than is really due to any true Hiſtory.* But is it not a little ſtrange, that this Author ſhould be ſo averſe to do *R. B.* Juſtice, to ſuggeſt, that he has ſaid no more of the Scriptures, than that they are *a faithful Hiſtory*, which of itſelf, is a very emphatical Expreſſion, and ſeldom applied to any prophane Hiſtory, though ever ſo true. But *R. B.* expreſly calls them, * 'the moſt excellent Writ-'ings in the World, and acknowledges them to 'be a very heavenly and divine Writing, and to 'be very uſeful and comfortable to the Church of 'Chriſt, and that whatſoever any do pretending 'to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, 'be accounted and reckoned a Deluſion of the 'Devil.' Is this commending no more than the hiſtorical Part? Can theſe things be ſaid of any true Hiſtory? How can this Reviewer review his own

* Page 68, 71, 86.

Performance, without reflecting upon his Conduct thus to misrepresent a deceased Author? And how can he expect to be credited in the Relation he gives of *a Woman who told him one of their Preachers called the Bible rotten Scripture?* Had he not in any Respect forfeited his Credit, as an Author, he could not expect such a Story would meet with Acceptance with thinking Men, it is at most but an unknown Woman's Story. And how does it become a Disputant, to bring such a Matter into the Controversy, which no other ways admits of an Answer or Defence, than putting the Negative, and the Asserter, to produce some Authority more than his own, and equal to the Credit he expects it shall meet with.

But our Author proceeds, and says, *That other Quakers have said, that it is dangerous to read the Scriptures, Truth defended*, p. 101. and adds, *what dangerous to read a faithful History?* This is a foul Perversion of the Words quoted, for the Author was writing an Answer to a selfish Priest, who made the Scriptures a Merchandise to get Money by. 'You, says the Author, take it to make a 'Trade upon it, so that some have 30, 40, some '50, 60, some 100 a Year, and so are Hirelings: 'You seem like Christ in Words, having painted 'yourselves with Christ's Word, and the Apostle's 'Words, but Christ cryed Wo unto such whited Walls,

'Walls, and here you read with Danger, becauſe 'you ſpeak of yourſelves, and it is dangerous to 'read that and to make a Trade of that which the 'Prophets, Chriſt, and the Apoſtles ſpoke forth 'freely.' Thus it is plain, the Author did not ſay, as *W. N.* hath aſſerted, it was dangerous for People to read the Scriptures, but dangerous for Men to read them to make a Trade of them, and to read them in that State wherein there is Danger of wrongly interpreting them, as the Apoſtle *Peter* obſerves, *Many that were unlearned and unſtable, wreſted to their own Deſtruction.* I do not apprehend, this is to be underſtood unlearned in human Literature, but unlearned in the Knowledge of the Spirit of God, who muſt be ſuppoſed the moſt proper Agent to open and unfold the Truths contained in the Scripture. And it appears, that this was the Author's Meaning by what follows, in the next Page. 'The Scriptures are for perfecting the Man of God, for the 'furniſhing of him, through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus, they are for Inſtruction, to inſtruct and admoniſh, but not to make a Trade on.'

But the Reviewer further aſſerts, *that* Fox *and* Hubberthorn, *ſay the Scripture are no ſtanding Rule*, and quotes *Truth's Defence*, pag. 101. And ſo endeavours to make them and *R. B.* claſh, that whereas *R. B.* aſſerts them a ſecondary Rule, they

he ſays, *ſay they are no ſtanding Rule*, and as they are no ſtanding Rule, conſequently not a ſecondary one. But I have carefully examined that Page, and ſeveral others, forward and backward, and cannot find any ſuch Aſſertion, ſo that I need ſay no more to that particular. *G. F.* ſays *W. N. ſaid the Scriptures are no Ground of Faith*, and quotes *Great Myſtery* pag. 302. *Your Rule, Paper and Ink will come to Duſt.* The firſt Part of this Charge, I think I have ſet in a clear Light already, in my Obſervations concerning the primary Rule: And *G. F.* could mean no other, than that they were not the principal Ground of Faith, and he plainly tells us who he conceives is, after he had been arguing *ad hominem*, 'The Scriptures, 'which ſignifies Writings, as you ſay outward 'Writings, Paper and Ink is not infallible, nor 'is not divine, but human; and a human 'Knowledge, from it Men get, and ſo Writings, 'Paper and Ink, that is not infallible, nor the 'Scripture, (conſidered thus) is not the Ground 'of Truth; but Chriſt, who was before the 'Scriptures were written.' So that from hence it appears, that Writings, Paper and Ink, could not be the only, or principal Rule; for ſuch a Rule muſt remain for ever ſo, and be uniform and intelligible to all, conſidering the ſeveral Capacities and Circumſtances of Men; but Paper and Ink would not remain for ever, but would come

to

to Duſt: And ſuppoſing that there was to be a total Extirpation of the Bible, what would be the Rule then? And this I apprehend is the natural Conſtruction of theſe Words of *G. F.* and a little Charity and Generoſity, might have ſaved the Reviewer the Labour of his Obſervations on that, as well as divers other matters.

To conclude this matter of the Scripture, I ſhall take Notice of one Paſſage more, which gives an equal Evidence to the foregoing, *Other* Quakers, ſays he, *have called the Scriptures Duſt, Dung, and Serpents Meat*, News coming out of the North, pag. 14, 34. In Page 34, I can find no Words relative to any ſuch Aſſertion, much leſs any direct Expreſſions of this Nature; but in Page 14, the Author is writing againſt wicked Men, Drunkards, Railers, and carnally minded, who yet lay claim to Religion, and partake in Communion the Bread and Wine, though void of the Life and Reality of Religion and Godlineſs; and ſo contenting themſelves with that which is not really ſubſtantial, nor will nouriſh the Soul to Eternal Life; and this by a comparitive Way of ſpeaking, he calls living upon Duſt, that is not ſubſtantial Food or Nouriſhment: And this, let it be in whatſoever it will, that Men place their Subſiſtence in, which is not really and truly ſo, it may comparitively be called living upon Duſt;

and

and thus the Author phraſes it: ‘ So the Serpent ‘ feeds upon Duſt, which is but the Letter, which ‘ is Death, and all this is in the firſt Birth, and ‘ the carnal Mind, that cannot pleaſe God; which ‘ feeds upon carnal Things, and their Goſpel is ‘ but Duſt, which is the Letter, and all this is in ‘ the carnal Mind feeding it, which is the Enemy ‘ againſt God, which is without God, in the Gene- ‘ration of *Cain* and the Wicked, whoſe Prayers ‘ are an Abomination, and whoſe Sacrifices God ‘ hath no Reſpect to.’

Thus it appears from this Quotation, that the Author doth not call the Scriptures Duſt, conſidered in themſelves, (as appears by his ſo frequently quoting them, for the maintenance of the Doctrines he laid down; having in the Space of 18 Pages, quoted not leſs than 90 Texts of Scripture) but as carnal minded Men feed upon them, and content themſelves with reading, and unwarrantably applying the Experiences of good Men in thoſe Days, and do not ſeek after a true Acquaintance with God, and come really and ſubſtantially to know the Truths of Religion; the former of which will prove no better a Foundation to depend on, than Duſt would be for Food; and this I apprehend is the natural Conſtruction of his Words, and is very little different from the Apoſtle 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. *The Letter kills, but the Spirit giveth*

eth Life: Though both theſe, a captious Adverſary may give a different Conſtruction to, and pervert the real Senſe of the Authors, which would equally make the Apoſtle to ſpeak as diſreſpectfully of the Letter of the Scripture, as the Author of *News coming out of the North*.

The Third Chapter of the *Review*, contains a Diſcourſe of the *Light within*; which Term, as it is very ſignificative and expreſſive, is frequently made Uſe of by the *Quakers*. In this Chapter it is to evident *W. N.* hath not uſed *R. B.* with that Impartiality which is due to every Author, but eſpecially to one who is deceaſed; nor has he treated the *Quakers* with that becoming Temper of mind; nor has exerciſed that Charity, which are ſuch graceful Ornaments to a Chriſtian: Theſe and other Conſiderations, give me Reaſon to conclude, that in his writing this Chapter, nay the whole Review, he ſtood in need of ſome Light, more than he ſeems to have had, to have aſſiſted him to have dealt more juſtly, to have reaſoned more calmly, and with more Strength and Diſtinction; which would better have ſhewn the Diſputant and the Chriſtian, and a real Deſire of reclaiming Men from Miſtakes in Religion.

I confeſs, it is ſome Concern to me, to ſee a Perſon who pretends to be a Miniſter of the Goſ-

pel, thus forfeit his Credit in ſo glaring a manner, and has taken ſo much Pains to contrive odd Words, and inſert jarring Phraſes on Purpoſe to make this great and glorious Truth appear contemptible.

GIVE me Leave then to ſet forth what it is the *Quakers* mean by the Term *Light*, and what *R. B.* declared and intended in his Apology, and if this appear rational and conſiſtent with the Holy Scriptures, ſurely no Man will be ſo far their Enemy as to deny it.

IT cannot be objected, that it is a Word of their own Invention, for that it is frequently made Uſe of in the Holy Writings, as appears by theſe following Places, John i. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Ver. 4. *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men.* Ver. 9. *That was the true Light which lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* John viii. 12. *Then ſpake Jeſus again unto them ſaying, I am the Light of the World, he that followeth me ſhall not walk in Darkneſs, but ſhall have the Light of Life.* John xii. 36. *While ye have the Light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the Children of Light.* 1 Pet. ii. 9. *Who hath called you out of Darkneſs into his marvellous Light.* 1 Joh. ii. 8. *Becauſe the Darkneſs is paſt, and the true Light now ſhines.* 2 Cor. iv. 6. *For God who commanded-*

manded Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs, hath ſhined in our Hearts, to give the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God, in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt. 1 John i. 5. *This is the Meſſage which we have of him, and declare unto you, God is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all.* Theſe and many other Places which I might produce, do plainly ſhew it to be a very common and familiar Term in the Scriptures, and therefore the *Quakers* can be no more blamed for uſing it, than they who in thoſe Times did, or the Tranſlators of the Scriptures could be, in giving us that Term, which they might conceive was moſt agreeable to the native Senſe.

So that the only matter is, whether the *Quakers* uſe it in the ſame Senſe, or annex to it a different Idea than what the Scripture doth; and herein I aſſert, they are determined by the Apoſtle *Paul*, Eph. v. 13. *Whatſoever doth make manifeſt is Light.* So that by this, they underſtand a Manifeſtation, or Diſcovery; and this is the Idea that they conſtantly annex to the Word *Light*, conformable to the Apoſtle, and ſound Reaſon.

But how have their Enemies in this particular abuſed them; to what Scorn and Contempt have they expoſed, even to the Mockery of Boys and Girls, and a Herd of Rabble, who have ſucked in their Prejudice from their Teachers, who thro-

Envy have fixed an ignominious Character to this People, for preaching the Doctrine of the *Light within*, or an inward Manifestation of the Spirit of Christ, and calling Men to a strict Observance of its Discoveries; how have they been misrepresented, as holding odd and Enthusiastick Notions in this Respect; as if they set up another *Light* in Opposition to, and Contradistinction from, the Light of our Lord Jesus Christ; Than which, not any Thing can be more untrue; for this which they assert and direct to, is no less, nor no other, than a Divine objective Manifestation of Christ in the Soul of Man, * 'which gives the Knowledge 'and Perception of Divine matters,' plainly shewing what his Duty is, and points out the true way to Salvation; and thus the *Quakers* follow the Example of their Lord and Master, who declared himself to be the *Light of the World*; in calling Men to believe in it, whilst they have the Opportunity of believing; and to this accords the Writings of *R. B.* in a full and plain manner, page 132. 'God (*says he*) hath communicated, and 'given unto every Man, a measure of the Light 'of his own Son, a measure of Grace, or a measure of the Spirit, which the Scriptures expresses 'by several Names, as the *Seed of the Kingdom*, 'the *Light that makes all Things manifest*, the *Word 'of God*, or *Manifestation of the Spirit to profit with*.'

He

* Letter to the Bishop of *Lichfield*.

He sheweth then the Light he speaks of, is the very same that the Scripture regards tho' described under different Denominations, yet one and the same Divine, Eternal, Immutable Principle, internally made manifest, as *R. B.* further declares p. 138. 'We understand a spiritual, heavenly and invisible Principle, in which 'God as Father, Son, and Spirit, dwells, a measure of which divine and glorious Life is in 'all Men, as a Seed which of its own Nature 'draws, invites, and inclines to God.' What more express Terms can be desired to set forth what *R. B.* and the *Quakers* mean by the Light, than what he hath here said; but these so express as they are, could not satisfie *W. N.* but he barbarously mangles this Quotation of *R. B.* and would have his Reader suppose that *R. B.* made this Light, which he calls a divine Principle, *like a Creature, an imperfect Creature.* *W. N.*'s Words are these, *He (R. B.) calls the Light within an heavenly Principle, Grace in the Heart, and the new Creature, all which Expressions seems to intend nothing else but Grace in the Heart. Now pray observe that true Grace whether it be much or little, is but a Creature, an imperfect Creature.*

Can *W. N.* read this without blushing to see what unfair Conclusions he has drawn from *R. B.*'s Words, such as they cannot any Way bear, and

such

ſuch as none but the moſt avowed Enemy, and one the moſt averſe to Truth would have been guilty of, can a heavenly Principle be a Creature? Can Grace in the Heart be an imperfect Creature? If this be true, then according to the Apoſtle we are ſaved by an imperfect Creature, for he ſays, *By Grace are ye ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the Gift of God.*

By Grace I underſtand a free Gift, and when we ſpeak of the Grace of God, we mean by it the Gift of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt for the Redemption of Men; and when we ſpeak of Grace in the Heart, we mean the Operation of the Spirit, by which the new Creature is brought forth; and this is what *R. B.* means with reſpect to calling the Light within a divine Principle or Grace, or Spirit, and this is what he aſſerts with Reſpect to the new Creature; he doth not call the divine and heavenly Principle the new Creature, as *W. N.* unfairly ſuggeſts, for that would have been to aſſert, that the Cauſe and the Effect were the ſame. But he ſays, 'We underſtand not this Seed, Light, or Grace, to be an 'Accident, as moſt Men Ignorantly do. But 'a real ſpiritual Subſtance, which the Soul of 'Man is capable to feel; and apprehend, 'from which that real ſpiritual inward Birth in 'Believers ariſes, called the new Creature, the

new

' new Man in the Heart, this ſeems ſtrange to
' Carnal minded Men.' And this ſeems ſtrange
to *William Notcut*. See then what injuſtice the
Reviewer hath done this deceaſed Author, thus
to endeavour to ſtamp Reproach on his Memo-
ry, as if he aſſerted that the divine Light he ſo
rationally contended for, was a Creature, an im-
perfect Creature. And ſo he proceeds, *What
muſt a Man believe in his own Grace, or a meaſure
of Grace within himſelf.* Certainly, this Author
doth not underſtand the meaning of the Word
Grace, or he would never uſe it in ſo confuſed a
Manner, how can a Man have any Grace of
his own? I have already ſet forth what is gene-
rally underſtood by Grace, that it is Favour
or Bounty extended from a Superiour to an In-
feriour; and how can there be any Superiority
and inferiority in one and the ſame individual?
But he has tranſpoſed the Words in the latter part a
little to help him, *Or* (ſays he) *in a meaſure of Grace
within themſelves*, here is a plain difference, *their
own Grace and a meaſure of Grace in themſelves*;
the former is abſurd, the latter Men are to be-
lieve according to the Scriptures, that there is a
meaſure or Manifeſtation of the Grace or Spirit
of God given to profit with. To deny this would
be, to object to the Scripture, and demur to that
being the Rule which *W. N.* hath ſo ſtrongly
contended for, ſo that he muſt ask the Scrip-

ures, not *R. B.* what must a Man believe, that *there is a measure of Grace within himself*, and they will directly Answer, Ephes. iv. 7. *But unto every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the Gift of Christ*, 1 Cor. xii. 7. *But the Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal.* And this is what the *Quakers* and *R. B.* call People to believe; but not in any Grace, Favour, or Goodness of their own, not of themselves, but in the Lord Jesus Christ who is that Spirit who is internally made manifest, whom the Apostle 1 Cor. xv. 47. *Calls the Second Man the Lord from Heaven* V. 44. *A quickning Spirit.* And herein *W. N.* may fall out with the Apostle, as well as *R. B.* And tell him that the Words *Second Man, the Lord from Heaven is a Creature, an imperfect Creature*, as much as a *heavenly Principle or Grace in the Heart.* But the Reviewer proceeds and asserts R. B. says, *This new Creature is what the Saints live upon, and are nourished by: Behold what Gospel the Light within Preaches.* And I may say, behold what Light he is led by, not to do Justice to the Authors he Quotes. I cannot find that *R. B.* lays down any such Doctrine, nor do I believe he would have been guilty of so gross an Absurdity, as to assert *that Men live upon their own Stock of Grace, and not upon Christ the Fountain.* This would have been so inconsistent with

the

the other Parts of his rational Performance. His Words are theſe p. 138. 'A meaſure of which 'divine and glorious Life is in all Men, as a 'Seed which of its own Nature draws, invites, 'and inclines to God, and this ſome call *Vehiculum Dei*, or the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, 'the Fleſh and Bloo d which came down from 'Heaven, of which all the Saints do feed, 'and are thereby nouriſhed unto Eternal Life.

I CANNOT but be ſurprized at the manner of *W. N*'s. Reaſoning p. 18. Where he repreſents *R. B.* as guilty of an Error; in pleading that the Light he contends for is Chriſt. This Blunder one might have excuſed in a Perſon who ſeldom or ever read the Scripture, for by them *R. B.* is effectually authorized from our Saviour's Words which I have before quoted, that he declared himſelf the *Light of the World*, and was propheſie d that *he ſhould be a Light*. Iſa. xlix. 6. *and a Leader*. Iſa. lv. 4. Herein *W. N.* is contending againſt the Scriptures rather than *R. B.* for nothing is more expreſly aſſerted in the holy Writings, ſo that by endeavouring to oppoſe this divine Principle of Light and Grace, one might really think that he was demuring to the Authority of outward Revelation. But ſays he. *We ſhall ſee afterwards that they ſet it far above Chriſt*. And to prove this Aſſertion,

he tells the Reader R. B. *makes the Light within to be the ſame with the Spirit of God.* And to ſhew that *R. B.* did aſſert this, the Author brings this Quotation, 'Thoſe that have the Goſpel outwardly preached, to them are not ſaved, but by the Work of Grace and Light in their Hearts.' Which the Reader will ſee what a notable Proof this is, *that* R. B. *makes the Light within to be the ſame with the Spirit of God.* I had once thought of tranſcribing this Paragraph at Length, which would ſerve for an Original, for certainly, there cannot be any thing more confuſed. Pray obſerve he aſſerts, *R. B.* ſays, *The Light within is Chriſt, and afterwards they ſet it far above Chriſt, and will have it to be the ſame with the Spirit of God.* This would argue, that *W. N.* ſuppoſes, that the Spirit of Chriſt and the Spirit of God, are two ſeparate and diſtinct Spirits, the one ſuperior to the other, for that which *W. N.* ſays, that they ſet the Light within, far above Chriſt, is the ſame with the Spirit of God, ſo that by this unaccountable Jumble, he inſinuates, that the Spirit of God is above the Spirit of Chriſt, and how will this agree with his Chapter about the Trinity.

But I have no Occaſion to conteſt the Matter, for it is plain from *R. B.* that he aſcribes the Light both to Chriſt and the Spirit of God, which he concludes are the ſame, that there is no Superiority,

rity, and conſequently by making the Light the ſame with the Spirit of God, it is not ſetting it far above Chriſt, and except this Author will undertake to ſhew, that Chriſt is inferior to the Spirit of God, he muſt acknowledge himſelf in an Error.

He proceeds, *R. B. confeſſes, that when they call upon Men to believe in Chriſt, they mean it the Light within*, but hath quoted no Place where this Confeſſion of *R. B*'s is to be found, and I have ſearched diligently, but cannot find what he hath here aſſerted. But to this Purpoſe, 'That when 'they call Men to believe in the Light within, 'they mean, the Manifeſtation of the Spirit of 'Chriſt.' Which I hope is no Error.

And *others*, ſays W. N. *When they ſpeak of Chriſt's being born, dying, and riſing again, mean all within them, and for this he quotes* Edward Burrough's works *p.* 149. I beg leave to ſay, it is a groſs Impoſition on the Reader, for there is not one Word in all that Page or the next, or any where that I find, though I have ſearched with Care, that ſo much as favours any ſuch Opinion. But in that Page 149 I find an expreſs Declaration to the contrary, which I ſhall here produce in anſwer to this Query. 'Is that very Man that was 'crucified on Mount *Calvary* between two Thieves

'whose Name is Jesus, the Son of *Mary*, is he 'the very Christ of God, yea or nay.'

To which *E. B.* answers, 'Yea, he is the very 'Christ of God, which was before the World 'was, by whom the World was made, who was 'made manifest from *Mary*'s Womb, and was 'persecuted to Death, by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*.

And notwithstanding this which the Reviewer must have seen, if he ever looked into *p.* 149. which he quoted, he has, with an Air of Assurance, asserted, that *they meant all within them.* But to let the Reader see what an admirable Way of Reasoning this Author has, and in what a fine Manner he draws Conclusions from Premises of his own laying down. I think it may not be improper to produce one entire Paragraph, which is as follows, *p.* 20. *From all what has been said describing the Light within, if it be Grace, if it be the new Man, or if it be the Spirit and the new Creature, then we infer from their Principles, that every natural Man has the Spirit of God, for they hold, that every one has the Light within, which they say is the same, and they bring* John i. 9, *to prove it, That was the true Light that lighteth every Man coming into the World, Jesus Christ lightens every Man that comes*

'into

into the World, ſome with the Light of Nature, others with divine Revelation, others with ſaving Light and Grace, and all Men with the Light of Conſcience. But that he enlighteneth every Man with ſaving Grace, cannot be gathered from that Scripture'.

I BEG the Reader to peruſe this carefully and conſider the Paragraph, and ſee if he can find out the Reviewer's Meaning, for my Part, I confeſs, I cannot tell what he intends: I do not mean whether the Inference be juſt, for that at firſt Sight diſcovers itſelf as unnatural as the Premiſes from which it is drawn are inconſiſtent, but what does he intend by Light of Nature, as oppoſed to Light of Conſcience, and divine Revelation as oppoſed to Light and Grace, and ſaving Light and Grace, as oppoſed to unſaving Light and Grace; here he makes ſuch a Jargon of Light, as no Man in his Senſes could ever dream of, let him tell us in his next, what he means by theſe Diſtinctions, and how he can with any tolerable Pretence blame the *Quakers* for aſſerting, that the Light they contend for is Chriſt, when he hath in this Paragraph, made Chriſt four Sorts of Light, *Light of Nature, Light of divine Revelation, ſaving Light and Grace, and Light of Conſcience,* and theſe not indifferently given to all, but diſtinctly given to ſome: Upon the whole, it is ſuch an

an unintelligible Piece, that the Reader ſtands in need of an Interpreter.

But how is this ſaving Light and Grace (according to *W. N.*) made known to Men, if eternally, it is only a mediate Revelation, which would be a very unſafe Dependance, becauſe that may by the Accidents of time be loſt: But if internally, then it is an inward immediate Manifeſtation which is the Light within, and this is what the *Quakers* ſay, that there is a Meaſure of ſaving Light and Grace internally made known to every Man ſufficient to his Salvation; one of theſe two Ways muſt be allowed, that ſaving Light and Grace is made known. The former of which, Millions of Souls muſt be damned to ſupport, for if it is confined to mediate Revelation, then thoſe who have not the Advantage of that Revelation, cannot have any Knowledge of ſaving Light and Grace, which would plunge by far the greateſt Part of the World into a moſt deplorable Condition, but this muſt be the Conſequence of the Reviewer's Doctrine.

But our Author goes on, *p.* 21. *The* Quakers ſays he, *have aſſerted, that the Light within is God, and attempt to prove it thus. That the Light within is an immediate Effect of God, and ſay they, ſuch as the Cauſe is, ſuch is the Effect*, from whence he

reaſons

reasons. *By their Argument it follows, that the Sun, Moon, and Stars, are Gods too, for they are the Effects of God's Power and Wisdom, and then it follows, that Men may worship them. No Wonder that* R. B. *calls upon Men to believe in the Light within, when he owns it to be God.* This Page and the next following of the Review, seems to be calculated at all Adventures to prejudice People against the *Quakers*, though at the Expence of his own Reputation; in this first he hath not quoted any Place to direct his Reader where to find the Matter he refers to, I have examined all the fixth Propoſition of *R. B.* and above 150 Pages in ſeveral other Propoſitions, and cannot find ſuch Expreſſions, he has brought, I ſuppoſe for *R. B's*, though there is no Name, Book, nor Page mentioned; a Proceeding which I judge will hardly be countenanced by any Reader, except thoſe who are deeply prejudiced in his Favour, I am certain, if he regards *R. B.* he knew better how to make Diſtinctions, than to make no Difference between a Cauſe, and an Effect of a Cauſe, ſo that I need not further obſerve on this Head, till *W. N.* has produced the Book and Page, which if he can, let him do it in his next Performance.

But pray compare theſe Words of the Reviewer with *p.* 19. he ſays, *No Wonder that* R. B. *ſhould call upon Men to believe in the Light, when they own*

it

it to be God, p. 21. he ſays, *now pray obſerve that true Grace whether it be much or little, is but a Creature, an imperfect Creature.* Theſe Words he draws as a Conſequence from *R. B*'s calling the divine Light a heavenly Principle, which he ſays is *but a Creature, an imperfect Creature.* And in *p.* 21. before quoted he ſays, *R. B. owns the Light within to be God, and calls upon Men to believe in it as ſuch*, So that in one Page with him, the Light within *is an imperfect Creature*, and in another, *it is God*, ſometimes *it is Chriſt*, and ſometimes not Chriſt, but ſet far above him, and other times it is neither one nor the other, and with ſuch Confuſion as this hath he attached *R. B*'s Apology impoſed on his Reader, and abuſed the *Quakers.*

I APPREHEND, he muſt make a notable Diſtinction to get off from the Imputation that he confounds *Grace* with *God* and *God* and *Grace with a Creature, an imperfect Creature.* In doing which I humbly conceive, he muſt acknowledge himſelf in an Error in one or the other, for if *R. B.* meant by the Light within as noted in *p.* 19. that *it is but an imperfect Creature*, how could he own it *to be God, and call Men to believe in it as ſuch.* But if he owned it to be God, how could he intend it an imperfect Creature, except he at the ſame time had been guilty of ſuch an unaccountable Jumble as the Reviewer, which would have been to

aſſert,

aſſert, that God was a Creature, and a Creature God, which, ſo prepoſterous and contradictory Propoſitions, could not be laid down by ſo excellent a Writer as *R. B.*

But ſays the Reviewer, *If Men do not own the Light within to be God, they muſt deny the Omnipreſence of God.* This comes without the Authority of either Book, Name or Page, ſo that I know not where to look for this Quotation; neither do I ſee there can lie any Objection againſt this, The Apoſtle 1 *John* i. 5. ſays, *That God is Light, and in him is no Darkneſs at all,* and to deny or object to the Reaſonableneſs and Poſſibility of the Shining of that glorious Light in the Minds of Men, would leſſen or call in Queſtion, the Omnipreſence of God, with regard to the Maſs of Mankind, when he is no other Way to be ſeen or known by them, but by the Manifeſtation or Revelation of his holy Spirit, as I have already maintained, for as the outward Sun cannot be ſeen but by the Afflux of its own Light, ſo we cannot ſee or know God, but by his own divine Light which diſcovers and directs to him.

But pray obſerve what Deductions our Author draws from theſe Premiſes. *Thus the Diſpute* (ſays he) *That becauſe God himſelf is preſent every where, therefore every thing that God acts or works muſt alſo*

be present every where as God is. And as he takes this to be the Dispute, so I conceive, it is exceeding foreign to it, for it is not about the Omnipresence of the several Acts or Works of God, but the Omnipresence of him in and by his divine Light, that is, by a Manifestation of himself, and by Omnipresence in this Case, I understand no no more than the Universality of the Manifestation of God to Mankind.

But however foreign I apprehend this of *W. N*'s to be from the Dispute, he concludes it near enough thus to pronounce, *O the Weakness and Knavery of those Men! O what Shifts will corrupt Minds betake themselves to, rather than submit to Truth.* On which I shall beg leave to borrow a Quotation from the Review, which I think very just to return in this Case, *p.* 21. *If this poor Man thought his Argument would prove his Assertion, then he was to be pitied, for his Head was weak. But if he thought that it would not prove it, then he is worthy to be contemned; for his Heart is naught; but to his own Master he standeth or falleth, and there we we leave him and his Folly.*

To proceed, *they also affirm*, says *W. N. that the Light within them is to be worshiped, and that it is a damnable Heresy to deny it.* Whether this Question be exact I cannot say, nor do I think it ma-

terial to examine, for take it as he hath quoted, and it admits of a fair Conſtruction, for if *they own the Light within to be God, and call Men to believe in it as ſuch,* as the Reviewer has already allowed they do, is it not Hereſy to deny him Worſhip; not that God is to be worſhiped in or thro' the Creature, or any Adoration to be payed to that by vertue of the indwelling of the Spirit of God; (which I apprehend was the unhappy Miſtake of thoſe weak People in the Caſe of *James Naylor*) but if that the Divine Light, which is Chriſt and God (as the Scriptures plentifuly ſet forth,) is not to be worſhiped, then I know not who is the proper Object of Worſhip.

But what is more aſtoniſhing than many things I have before taken notice of, is what follows of *W. N's They have affirmed* (ſays he) *that the Light within is a more ſure Guide, than the Law of God, and quotes* G. F's *great Myſtery*, but no Page, *if the Light within thee bids a Man to do any thing contrary to the Law of God, he may do it, if it bids a Man to ſteal, then he ought to ſteal, theſe Words were ſpoken on occaſion of a* Quaker *ſtealing an Hour Glaſs out of the Church,* G. F. *vindicated the Fact, not as an Act of ſtealing, but as the Man followed the Direction of the Light within, and ſaid alſo if the Light within had bid him, he might alſo have ſtolen the Communion Plate from the Church.*

WHEN I read theſe Paſſages in the Review, I confeſs, I was ſtruck with Surprize, and concluded, that if *G. F.* had ſaid thus, I muſt be obliged to alter my good Opinion of him, for that they never could be the Dictates of the pure and holy Spirit of Wiſdom and Juſtice, but when I came to examine the Place in *G. F's Great Myſtery*. My Aſtoniſhment was the greater, to ſee, that what *W. N.* had ſet down in *Italick*, to be underſtood as a real Quotation from *G. F.* that there is not one Word true, not as *making the Light within a more ſure Guide than the Law of God*, which would have been prepoſterous, for the Law is Light, and the Light is the Rule and Guide, and cannot impoſe or dictate contrariwiſe, the *Pſalmiſt* ſays, cxix. 105. *Thy Word is as a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path.* I ſay there is not what is before mentioned, Nor *If the Light within bid a Man to ſteal, he ought to ſteal, nor that if it had bid him, he might have ſtolen the Communion Plate from the Church.* O groſs abuſe, and moſt untrue Repreſentation. But in this I apprehend the Reviewer is impoſed on by the *Broad Sheet*, and took for granted, what that bitter Enemy to the *Quakers* has there ſet down, moſt Part of which, is utterly falſe. And this may ſerve as a looking Glaſs, to ſee both him and our Author *W. N.* But had *W. N.* examined the Place, certainly he would not have been ſo

hardy

hardy to have asserted such Things in the Face of the World, for which he could have no Foundation from *G. F.* could he expect he should lay unobserved and unreplied to; this would have been an Injury done to the Dead, but of this I cannot acquit *W. N.* that he hath exceeded even what that avowed Enemy hath said in that *Sheet*, he has put on a better Air of Modesty, for he only draws it as a Consequence from the Premimises he had laid down: 'Note (*says he*) by the 'same Pretence they may take away the Church 'Plate, or any Thing else.'

But the Reviewer roundly asserts, *That G. F. also said, if the Light within had bid him, he might also have stolen the Communion-Plate from the Church.* When there is not one Word of this Nature, as I have before observed, and how he can answer this Imposition on the Reader, and the Injustice done to *G. F.*'s Memory, he best knows.

Before I leave this Matter, I shall give *G. F.*'s Words verbatim in *Great Mystery*, pag. 77. which both the Authors of the *Broad-Sheet*, and the Reviewer refer to, in Answer to five Priests who say thus; 'And ye say, some of them go naked 'and another to come and say, he had a Call im-'mediately

'mediately from Heaven, to take away the 'Prieſt's Hour-Glaſs.'

To which *G. F.* anſwers, 'And as for any be-'ing moved of the Lord to take away your Glaſs 'from you, by the Eternal Power of God; it is 'owned, and to take away your Limit, carnal 'Limit to your Earthly Spirits that are gone out 'into the World from the Apoſtles, from the 'Spirit.'

THESE are every Word *G. F.* ſaith about the Hour-Glaſs, and I dare the Reviewer to ſhew where he has any where ſaid more; or any Thing of what he has brought for *G. F's* And in this he doth not vindicate it in any Reſpect, as an Act done; neither is there any Word of Stealing, either in what the Prieſts ſay, or *G. F's* Anſwer, neither hath he ſaid, that the Man was moved of the Lord to any ſuch Act, but only anſwers *ad hominem*, to an Aſſertion of theirs, 'That if any 'Perſon ſhould really be moved by the Eternal 'Power of God, to ſuch a Thing, to take away 'their Limit of Preaching to a preciſe Time, 'which he apprehended, was not the Cuſtom of 'the Apoſtles, this is owned.' And will any one pretend to diſpute it, if they did, it would be demurring to the Authority of an infinite Power: But it cannot be inferred, that *G. F.* vindicated it

as

as a Fact done, or aſſerted that the Spirit of God did immediately call the Man to ſuch a Service; but only upon a Suppoſition that whatever is done in Conſequence of a divine Command, is defenſible, and what ought not to be denied.

So that the Reviewer has moſt barbouroufly attempted to prejudice the memory of *G. F.* by ſuppoſing, that the Light within, which is the Spirit of Chriſt dictated contrariwiſe to the Law of God; nay even to commit Felony, and ſo directed People to that which would lead them a *readier Way to the* Gallows *than to* Heaven. Which the Reader may determine whether this is becoming one who calls himſelf Miniſter of the Goſpel, or any Ways conſiſtent with common Honeſty.

I have now ended my Obſervations on the Chapter of the *Light within*; and the next I take Notice of in Courſe is the 4th Chapter, about the *Trinity*, to which I need ſay but very little; for that this Point of Doctrine, I humbly conceive the *Quakers* are on the ſafeſt Bottom, which is that which the Reviewer calls the only Rule of Faith and Manners, the Holy Scripture: And herein they allow and abide by them to be the Rule of Doctrine, even when the greateſt Contenders for their being the only Rule, depart from them; by which means, they plunge themſelves into inextri-

cable

cable Difficulties, confounding themselves and their Readers, with Distinctions which are unscriptural, and which, strictly speaking, they can have no direct Idea of; so that whatsoever the Scriptures say of the *Trinity*, the *Quakers* firmly believe: 1 John v. 7. *That there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.* But how, and in what manner, they dont pretend to define: I need not mention the endless Contests that have arisen on this Point of Doctrine, with what Heat they have been carried on both Sides, and every Person may judge of the Effects; so that in this Case the Reviewer had better be uniform and consistent with himself, in abiding by the Scripture as a Rule; for I imagine him not equal to the Controversy as generally managed, in which very great Men have found themselves in great Difficulties: The *Quakers* therefore, and *R. B.* have resolved all their Belief of this Doctrine into the Sacred Writings, and when any read them touching this Point, they read the Faith of the *Quakers*. And if this is not sufficient to satisfie the Reviewer, it is better he should remain unsatisfied, than they should depart from the Scripture on Purpose to please him.*

In

* In the Quotation of *Satan disrob'd*, the Reviewer further manifests his ill Design of abusing the *Quakers*; for that Book

IN the 5th Chapter of the Review, the Author endeavours to ſhew, that the *Quakers* deny the outward Perſon of Chriſt, and that *when they pretend to preach Chriſt, yet they do not intend it of God's Chriſt, or the Scripture Chriſt, but only of the Light in them*, page 28. And to this Purpoſe he has produced divers Quotations, moſt of which are notoriouſly untrue, as I ſhall preſently manifeſt: I have ſet forth what it is the *Quakers* mean by the Light within, that it is an Internal, the Manifeſtation of the very Chriſt of God, that Chriſt whom the Scriptures declare, and not another.

THIS *R. B.* hath plentifully ſet forth in his Apology, which the Reader will ſee, by peruſing it, and in particular ſpeaking of Chriſt, pag. 27. he ſays, 'Hence he is fitly called the Mediator 'between God and Man; for having been with 'God from all Eternity, being himſelf God, and 'alſo in Time partaking of the Nature of Man, 'through him is the Goodneſs and Love of God 'conveyed to Mankind.' This without any other ought to be received as an ample Confeſſion, that when they ſpeak of Chriſt, they mean the

Book which he has quoted as *William Penn's*, is not of his writing, but a virulent Adverſary, Parſon *Leſley*, whom our Author, I apprehend, has too much copied after, in aſſerting right or wrong, Truth or Falſhood, any Thing he thought would prejudice the *Quakers*.

Chriſt of God, the Scripture Chriſt, to uſe the Reviewers Phraſe, and not another; and this alſo ſhews they believe the Eternity of the Son of God, which may help to take away the Suggeſtion of his in his Chapter about the *Trinity*.

BUT ſays he, *Other* Quakers *have ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt; the Light within is the true Chriſt, but the outward Chriſt is a falſe Chriſt*: For this he quotes *G. F's Great Myſtery*, pag. 226. Again, *If there be any other Chriſt than he that was crucified within, he is a falſe Chriſt*: All which the Reviewer pronounces, *O horrid Blaſphemy, They make the Chriſt of God, who was crucified without the Gates of* Jeruſalem, *a falſe Chriſt*.

THIS I may truly ſay is a horrid Abuſe on *G. F.* and an Impoſition on the Reader: The firſt Part of this Quotation is falſe, and the latter Part is ſo far from Blaſphemy, that it is no leſs than Blaſphemy to deny the Truth of it; for *G. F.* doth expreſly ſet forth in ſeveral foregoing Paragraphs what it is he intended; that Chriſt who is manifeſt within, is the very ſame Chriſt who was crucified, and not another; and he that aſſerts any other Chriſt, that is a falſe Chriſt, which muſt certainly be ſo; his Words are theſe, pag. 206. 'If Chriſt that is crucified, 'be not within, and Chriſt that's riſen, be not 'within, I ſay that you all are Reprobates; and 'this

'this is not oppoſite to Jeſus Chriſt without, that 'died at *Jeruſalem*, but the ſame; for who eats 'his Fleſh, has it within them, and this is not a 'new Goſpel: Again, in anſwer to a Queſtion, 'which (*ſays he*) is contrary to the Faith of the A-'poſtles, which preached Chriſt that's crucified 'within, and not another; him that was raiſed up 'from the Dead, was riſen that Lord Jeſus Chriſt 'within, the ſame Yeſterday, to Day, and for ever, 'by whom the World was made, was glorified with 'the Father before the World began; it was he 'that was manifeſt in the Saints; that was, and 'is, and not another.' From hence it is evident, that *G. F.* very clearly and diſtinctly ſets forth what he meant, that there is but one Chriſt, the Saviour of Mankind, who was outwardly manifeſt, and inwardly revealed, the very ſame Eternal Son of God; and if there is 'any other than 'this Chriſt, he is a falſe Chriſt;' and ſo from theſe Premiſes he draws this one general Concluſion. 'Now I ſay, if there be any other Chriſt but he 'that was crucified, within, he is a falſe Chriſt,' becauſe the ſame Chriſt who was crucified without, has figuratively been crucified within; according to the Apoſtle, *Heb.* vi. 6. *Seeing they crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to open Shame.* So that from hence it appears, the Reviewer has abuſed *G. F.* for there is not one Word, *That the outward Chriſt is a falſe Chriſt*: And I

challenge him to ſhew any ſuch Paſſage in all *G. F's* Writings. He proceeds, and *aſſerts, that others have ſaid, that Chriſt had no Body, and that there never was ſuch a Chriſt in the World, that was ſeen with carnal Eyes, nor heard with carnal Ears*, Gordon's Reply pag. 20. *And that Chriſt's Body was no more than a Cloak, or Vail, like the Bodies in which the Angels have appeared in former Times.* This Aſſertion, I ſhall endeavour to convince the Reader is untrue, by expreſs Declaration to the contrary: As to *Gordon's Reply*, I know nothing of it; I ſuppoſe it to be ſome antiquated Piece, nor do I apprehend, ſuppoſing he had ſaid ſo, that the Society is accountable for the odd Expreſſions of every Perſon who claims Membership, as I have in the Beginning obſerved, and the ſame I extend to *Chriſtopher Atkinſon*, both which, I am credibly informed, were diſowned by the Society; and therefore I ſhall not take upon me a Vindication of their Expreſſions, though at the ſame Time, I have reaſon to conclude from the many falſe Quotations of the Reviewers, that what he has brought as *Gordon's* and *Atkinſon's*, are of the ſame Stamp.

But to ſhew that the *Quakers*, as a Society, did not believe the Body of Chriſt to be as this Author hath aſſerted, I produce here a Declaration of *Joſeph Wyeth*, in his *Switch for the Snake*,

Sect.

Sect. 9. pag. 191. published on the Behalf of the Society, which is as follows,

'I do here of set Purpose declare it as a Truth, 'which now is, and always hath been (since we 'were a People) believed and declared by us, 'that the Word which was in the Beginning with 'God, by which all Things were made, did, in 'the Fulness of Time, according to the Appoint- 'of the Father, take Flesh, and was born of the 'Virgin *Mary*, and that in that Body of Flesh, 'the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily. Thus 'in the Largeness of the Expression, and Sense 'of Scripture, we do truly and sincerely own, 'according to *John* i. 14. That the Word was 'made Flesh, and dwelt on the Earth, and took 'not on him the Nature of Angels, nor any aërial 'or fantastical Body, but the Seed of *Abraham* 'and *David*; and this he did for the same Reason 'and Behoof mentioned by the Apostle, *Heb.* ii. '17, 18.'

W. N. goes on, page 28, and says, *Therefore* Robert Barclay *is proved a Lyar, in that he has said, we do not equal our selves to Christ; he has asserted it without Shame or Conscience, for he knew that some of his Friends had spoken and written these Things*; George Fox's News coming out of the North, *pag.* 15, saith, *I am the Door that ever*

was

was the same Christ, Yesterday, to Day, and for ever, and that he was propheſied of, and now is fulfilled: and he adds, I am he that was before all Languages were. This Blaſphemy is groſs enough, and to be abhorr'd by all pious Souls.

For theſe Aſſertions, I find the Reviewer has been beholden to the *Broad-ſheet*; and I would aſk the Reader, what Credit can be given, either to that or *W. N.* to aſſert ſo great a Falſhood; it is as great an Abuſe on an Author, and as baſe, and an injurious a Deſign upon a Society, as ever I met with. When I was reading this Paſſage, there happened to come to ſee me one of *W. N*'s Opinion, and for ought I know, one of the Members of his Society, to whom I ſhewed the Quotation of *W. N*'s and afterwards *G F*'s *News coming out of the North*, both which he compared together; I aſked his Opinion of it, 'Why really, ſays he, 'I am ſurprized that Mr. *N.* who I always have 'heard a good Character of, and eſteemed him a 'good Man, ſhould be guilty of ſuch an Over-'ſight: It is really, he adds, a great Injuſtice 'done to the Author, and a violent Miſrepre-'ſentation of your People, and makes you look 'ridiculous, by having ſuch a Perſon belonging 'to you, who by this is made to appear guilty of 'Blaſphemy, when it is not ſo, but quite the Re-'verſe.' I confeſs, I did not expect quite ſo can-

did

did an Answer, nor do I see how he could say less: But that the Reader may likewise form a Judgment of this matter, I shall transcribe out of *G. F.* what is relative to it, and the References in the margin, as they stand in *News coming out of the North*, pag. 15.

'AND *Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth, and* 'the *Life.* And he is the Porter that opens it. *John xiv.* 6.
'*I am the same Door*, that ever was, the same 'Christ to Day, Yesterday, and for ever. The 'Light is the Eye that sees it, *which Light is* *John i. 3.* '*Christ*; and that Seed passing after Christ out of 'Egypt, the House of Darkness, from under *Luke xi.* 'the Law, the Righteousness of the Law is ful- *34.* 'filled in us, who walk not after the Flesh, but 'after the Spirit, as the Apostle saith, *and so he* 'goes on, you that are in the Wilderness Witness 'this with me, and the same Temptations even to 'despair, and to make themselves away; the De- 'vil before he would go out of his Kingdom, he 'would Destroy all. But look at the Captain of 'our Salvation, Jesus Christ, who hath passed 'before, who was tempted, the Captain of our 'Salvation.

Now let the Reader Judge, whether the Author or *R. B.* demerits the Character he hath liberally gave *R. B.* It is plain *G. F.* declares

Christ

Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, the ſame to Day, Yeſterday, and for ever, and where he ſays, *I am the Door*, he refers to ſeveral Scriptures, where Chriſt declared himſelf in the firſt Perſonal Pronoun; I ſhall add to this what I have quoted of *G. F.* already, and leave it to the Reader to determine as he thinks juſt and equal. 'This Jeſus hath God 'raiſed up from the Dead, and we the People 'of God in ſcorn called *Quakers*, do ſay that 'there is no Salvation in any other Name given 'under Heaven whereby Men muſt be ſaved, but 'in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt of *Nazareth*, which 'was crucified without the Gates of *Jeruſalem*, 'whom God hath raiſed from the Dead.' *Fox's Doctrinals* p. 417.

But ſays *W. N. And yet we may turn again and ſee greater Abominations than theſe, as if it were not enough to put themſelves in the Place of Chriſt. We may alſo ſee that they have ſet themſelves above Chriſt; they ſay what Chriſt did, was but a Type of the Light within them, Chriſt without was but a Shadow, and we are the Subſtance.* This is ſtrange indeed! *Greater Abominations*! What can be greater Abomination than Blaſphemy? But for what he has brought here, there is neither Book, Name, nor Page, ſo that I demur to his Authority, and deny the Matter.

I SHALL not say much more to this Chapter; for what *W. N.* hath asserted, that some one (but I know not who) hath *asserted, that the Blood of Christ was no better than the Blood of a common Thief*: I deny, and call on him to prove it; for which he has no better Authority than the *Broad Sheet*. *W. N.* hath quoted *Isaac Pennington, Quest.* 1. *p.* 25. *That the Blood of Christ is not sufficient to cleanse the Soul from Sin.* But I assure the Reader, this is untrue, and cannot be less than Forgery; for *Isaac Pennington* hath in that very Page asserted the contrary, which is as follows, in the Words of the Apostle, 1 *John* i. 7. *If we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, we have Fellowship one with another, and the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all Sin.* And again, *the Corruption and Filth is washed away by the Blood, and the Soul, Mind and Conscience cleansed from it.* And again in Part II. p. 105. of his Works, he saith, "And as for denying Redemption by the Blood of "Christ; O how will he answer this Charge to "God, which none upon the Earth (as the Lord "knoweth) are so taught, and do so truly, right-"ly and fully own Redemption by the Blood of Christ

K

* In Answer to an Adversary who had charged the *Quakers* with denying Redemption by the Blood of Christ.

'Chriſt, as the Lord hath taught us to do; 'for we own the Blood of our Lord Jeſus 'Chriſt, both outwardly and inwardly, both 'as it was ſhed on the Croſs, and as it is ſprink-'led on our Conſciencies.' His Declaration concerning Redemption by the Blood of Chriſt is ſo full and ſtrong, that I need bring no more; though, if Occaſion required, I could produce near forty Places from the Writings of the ſame Author which would accord hereto; and therefore the Reviewer, in this Point, is alſo ſhewed to be what he is, in many others before noted. I had like to forgot to obſerve concerning the Quotation brought from *E. B.* which, to do *W. N.* juſtice, is the only true and exact Quotation, I may venture to ſay, he hath brought in his whole Performance, which he hath endeavoured to make appear, as black and as contrary to the Language of the Spirit of God, as he is capable of. But I apprehend, that although the Paſſage be truly quoted, yet his Obſervations and Concluſions are not juſt; but that the Words of *E. B.* are capable of a fair Conſtruction, which is oppoſite to that of the Reviewer's; and that the Reader may ſee this, I ſhall ſet down the Words of *E. B.* exactly. 'It plainly appears '(ſays he) that the Sufferings of the People 'of God in this Age, is a greater Suffering, and 'more unjuſt, than in the Days of Chriſt, or his

'Apoſtles,

'Apoſtles, or in any time ſince. Queen *Mary's* Days brought not forth a Suffering 'more cruel, in many reſpects as doth appear, 'Firſt, What was done to Chriſt and his A-'poſtles, was chiefly done by Law, and in a 'great part by the due Execution of a Law; 'and alſo the Martyrs in Queen *Mary's* Days 'had more juſt Examination, and a more juſt 'Proſecution in Law, than the People of God 'have now. For now it is matter for Conſcience 'among ſome Magiſtrates in *England* to caſt 'Men into Priſon, and confine them, and to 'cauſe their Goods to be ſpoiled, without any 'Law, or the due Execution of a Law; which 'is utterly contrary to the Charters of *England*. 'And hereby it appears, the Sufferings to be 'more unjuſt, becauſe what the Perſecutors of 'old did to the People of God, they did by a Law, 'and by the due Execution of a Law; but now 'many are cauſed to ſuffer deeply, whom the 'Tranſgreſſion of no Law, good or bad, can 'be charged againſt, and others ſuffer without 'the due Execution of a Law.' Thus *E. B.* And indeed he explains himſelf ſufficiently without any help; for he doth not ſay, the Sufferings were greater, or more unjuſt, conſidered in themſelves as Sufferings; but only as the one ſuffer'd in Conſequence of a Law and a due proceſs, ſo the other ſuffered without any Law, and conſequent-

ly no due Process. So that by this, it doth not follow, that if Jesus Christ was crucified by the due Execution of a Law, *then he was a Sinner, and those that put him to Death, were clear from the guilt of his Blood*; for they did not put him to Death, believing he was really the Son of God, but as a blasphemous Person: The *Jews* had a Law that made it Death for any Person who was found guilty of Blasphemy, and by this Law Jesus was put to Death, though he was not guilty of Blasphemy, and consequently he had not transgress'd that Law, and therefore was not a Sinner, because he was the Son of God, the same he declar'd himself to be; and this as the *Jews* did not believe, they condemned him on their Statute of Blasphemy, so that he was prosecuted in consequence of a supposed Breach of a known Law. And thus it was with the Apostles, that as they declared themselves his Disciples and Followers, so they were prosecuted either by the Laws then in being, or Laws made on Purpose to prosecute them, but all went by legal Process, as we find in the Case of *Paul* appealing to *Cæsar*. So that all that *E. B.* could intend, and indeed did set forth, was, that the Injustice arises from being prosecuted without the Breach of any Law, good or bad. There was no Law to oblige Men to pull off their Hat, or

againſt ſaying (Thee) to a ſingle Perſon, and other trivial matters, as *E. B.* obſerves.

But for theſe very Things many have been impriſoned, and barbarouſly uſed, though committed without due Proceſs, or the breach of any Law: And this he calls more unjuſt, and I think very properly; for ſuppoſe a Perſon ſhould be taken up for a Fact ſuppoſed to be committed, and he is try'd by due Proceſs, he having tranſgreſs'd a Law, or ſuppoſed to have ſo done, whether good or bad, that alters not the Caſe, and he ſhould be condemned, and another ſhould by the Envy or exceeding Prejudice of a Magiſtrate be taken up, tho', he had really tranſgreſs'd no Law, and without due Proceſs he is impriſon'd, and his Goods ſpoiled; which of theſe two would be the moſt unjuſt? I conclude the latter, and I believe ſo will every judicious Reader; and this is what *E. B.* hath ſet forth in the Paſſage before quoted.

I COME now to take Notice of the Chapter about Perfection, and a little will do for this, for it is indeed an imperfect Piece; and I ſhould have paſſed over this, had it not been for two or three Places concerning *R. B.* and ſome untrue Quotations.

R. B.

R. B. ſets forth very clearly what he meant by Perfection, p. 243. 'That (ſays he) by this we 'underſtand, not ſuch a Perfection as may not 'admit of a daily Growth, and conſequently 'mean not as if we were to be pure, holy, and 'perfect, as God in his divine Attributes of Wiſ-'dom, Knowledge and Purity; but only a Per-'fection proportionable and anſwerable to Man's 'meaſure, whereby we are kept from tranſgreſſing 'the Law of God. Again, Even as a little Gold 'is perfect Gold in its kind, as well as a great 'Maſs; and a Child hath a perfect Body, as well 'as a Man, tho' it daily grow more and more.'

THIS is what *R. B.* means by Perfection, and the Reviewer may well aſk, who does the Man fight againſt, becauſe I cannot ſee how any Man upon Chriſtian Principles can oppoſe it. But then, why (to uſe *W. N*'s own Phraſe) did he fight againſt *R. B.* in this, ſeeing he was of his Opinion? And why does he ſay, *Who can credit ſuch a Man in any other thing? he has ſhewn who is his Father, even the Father of Lies. Will he tell a Lie for God's Sake, his own Cauſe muſt be bad if he needs it.* But for whoſe ſake does our Reviewer make ſo free with his Pen? And how bad muſt his Cauſe be to need ſo many of the ſame Stamp he charges *R. B.* with? And how can he expect to be credited after all this? Nay even in this very Page, I ſhall ſhew that for the

ſake

ſake of ſome body or ſomething he is not clear, he charges *R. B.* with aſſerting, *That others may perhaps ſpeak more certainly of this State, as having arrived to it; for me, I ſhall ſpeak modeſtly, as acknowledging my ſelf not* to have *arrived at it.* And this State that our Author aſſerts *R. B.* ſays, he had not arived at, is the State before mentioned; but to make it plain, I ſhall again ſet down the Words. 'By Perfection we mean 'that which is perfect in its Kind, not in Degree; 'as a little Gold is perfect, tho' it be not ſo 'much as the Maſs, or a Child hath a perfect 'Body as well as a Man.' And then adds our Reviewer, yet he (*R. B.*) ſaith, that he had not arrived at it, which *R. B.* doth not ſay; and therefore, pray Reader, from what Father does this come? But *R. B.* ſetting forth the poſſibility of a higher State than that beforementioned, ſays thus. 'Tho' I affirm that after a Man hath 'arrived to ſuch a Condition in which a Man may 'not ſin, he yet may ſin, I will nevertheleſs 'not deny, but there may be a State attain'd in 'this Life, in which to do Righteouſneſs, may 'become ſo natural to the regenerate Seed, that 'in the ſtability of this Condition they cannot 'ſin. Others may perhaps ſpeak more certain-'ly of this State, as having arrived to it. For 'me, I ſhall ſpeak modeſtly, as acknowledging 'my ſelf not to have arrived at it, yet I dare 'not deny it.

And

And this is that State *R. B.* acknowledges he had arrived at, and not the other, which the Reviewer has asserted; and herein I ask, whether he doth not more prevaricate with God and Man, (which are his own Words) than *R. B.*?

The Reviewer with his usual Certainty asserts, *George Whitehead in his Voice of Wisdom, says, p. 36. The Righteousness that is in them is infinite.* And for this I judge our Author is beholden to the *Broad Sheet*, or some such Author, for I cannot find what he hath here asserted, so that I need say no more to that at present.

Now hear also, says W. N. *what their Apostle saith,* Great Mystery, *p.* 110, 111, 231, 271, 281. *so many times over has he affirmed, that they are free from all sin, and that it is the Doctrine of Devils to teach, that Men shall have Sin as long as they be on Earth; the same Author said also, p.* 248. *that they are perfect as God.* And these things he hath affirmed so many times over, are every one untrue, as I shall make appear by the several Places refer'd to. *G. M. p.* 110. there is not one Word of that sort, or on that Subject, *p.* 111. he says, 'All Sin 'is Error, and who be in it, be in Error, which 'the Apostle said, that they were made free from, 'and had put off the the Body of Sin, and by the 'Blood of Christ was cleansed from all Sin, and by

' by one Offering he had perfected for ever them
' that are ſanctified; and ſo they ſay, that Men
' muſt have Sin while they live upon the Earth,
' and that plead for it, they are not the Friends of
' Chriſt. For who are the Friends of Chriſt, be in
' his Power, a Top of the Power of Sin; trample
' it under Foot, *p.* 231. *G. F.* ſaith, ' God ſaid
' to *Adam* the Seed of the Woman ſhould bruiſe
' the Serpent's Head, Chriſt the Promiſe,
' the Mediator, made the Way which was the
' Way in again to God, of Man's Redemption,
' and got down the Serpent's Head, which got
' up in Tranſgreſſion, that Chriſt the Head ſhall
' bear Rule, that the Seed of the Woman ſhould
' have Dominion, the ſecond *Adam*, the Seed
' Chriſt Jeſus, the Lord from Heaven; Perfection
' is not to be attained to by the Life ye live, untill
' ye come to the Principle of God in you, and all
' who come to Chriſt the ſecond *Adam*, they come
' to Perfection,' *p.* 271. Theſe are all the Words
on this Subject, in this Page, ' Thou ſpeakeſt of
' giving Thanks, and craving a Bleſſing, and
' yet you ſay you muſt have a Body of Sin while
' you be upon Earth, *p.* 281. The Life of the
' Saints is Chriſt, not ſinful at all, and they are
' ceaſed from their own Works, and are true Be-
' lievers, and the Works of Faith are not ſinful,
' and to this Purpoſe, is what is contained in this
' Page, but not any thing as the Reviewer hath

quoted, *p.* 248. where *W. N.* aſſerts *G. F.* ſays that they are perfect as God, which is untrue, there are no Words relative to ſuch an Aſſertion much leſs expreſſive thereof, and now what will the Reviewer ſay, when he hath in every one of the Pages, aſſerted that which is not true, what can that Man's Religion be worth, that ſhall take ſuch Meaſures to ſupport it? I need not ſay more to this Chapter, for my principal Deſign was to clear the Perſons he charged with Errors on the Doctrine of Perfection, as for *James Naylor* it is not my Province to meddle with him, though I am certain *W. N.* has abuſed him likewiſe in that Quotation, but if he had ſaid ſo, I do not apprehend the *Quakers* in this Caſe, are accountable any more than they were in the other mentioned in the fore Part of this Letter.

I come now to ſpeak to the ſeventh Chapter, concerning Women's Speaking in the Church.

AND it is a Wonder, he did not title this Chapter againſt Women's preaching, ſeeing he hath been ſo liberal with the Authors he has quoted. But this Subject he hath taken a pretty deal of Pains about, and indeed more method than in any other Part of his Review; but notwithſtanding, I do not apprehend it more concluſive, he imbarks in this Affair upon *A Letter of* Solomon Eccles *to*

John

John Story, *that Women's preaching is a great Ordinance which Christ Jesus set up in his Church.* To which I object, for I know nothing of any such Letter, neither is it supported with any Authority but his own, and I confess, he has forfeited his Credit so much with me, that I shall not accept any thing without Evidence, so that I shall consider the Matter separate from any such Assertion.

Our Author has taken in this Chapter a deal of Freedom to comment upon the several Places of Scripture on this Point, and certainly he will allow me the same Liberty, which will be directly contrary to him, and therefore both cannot be true, in the first Place, I apprehend that 1 *Cor.* xiv. 34.* *Let your Women keep Silence in the Church, for it is*

* *Pool's Annotations.* 'Though the Woman 1 *Tim.* ii. 12. 'be forbidden to teach, and commanded to be in Silence; 'yet that Text must be understood of ordinary Women, and 'inordinary Cases, not concerning such as propheſied from 'an Extraordinary Impulse or Motion of the Spirit. We 'read of Women Propheteſſes both in the old and new Te'ſtament, such was *Huldah* in *Josiah*'s Time, and *Anna*, of 'whom we read *Luke* ii. 36. and we read that *Philip* had 'four Daughters that did propheſy, *Acts* xxi. 9.

'* *Pool* in his *Annotations* on these Words, *Let your Wo'men keep Silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto 'them to speak*, &c. says, this Rule must be restrained to 'ordinary Propheſyings: For certainly, if the Spirit of 'Prophecy came upon a Woman in the Church, she might 'speak

not permitted unto them to ſpeak, does not exclude them from preaching, except that ſpeaking and preaching are the ſame. But what I gather from this Text is, that as it was written to the Church of *Corinth*, *let your Women keep Silence*, it was a particular Reſtricti on on ſome particular Reaſon and Account, it is very likely, that the Women might take too much upon them, and be over buſy in asking Queſtions, and endeavour to uſurp Authority over the Man, ſeeing they partook alike of Grace, and were Sharers in the pouring forth of the Holy Ghoſt, at the time of Pentecoſt. And this muſt be the Caſe, otherwiſe the Apoſtle muſt be accuſed of Contradiction by the Oppoſers of Womens preaching, when he gives ſuch plain Directions how Women are to behave themſelves when praying or propheſying, 1 *Cor.* xi. 4, 5. *Every Woman that prayeth or propheſyeth with her Head uncovered, diſhonoureth her Head.* Now this would have been inconſiſtent with what the Apoſtle in the other Place delivered, if it was deſigned to be a general Prohibition to Womens preaching propheſying or praying. And if this was a general Prohibition againſt Womens ſpeaking in the Church, then I cannot ſee how the Oppoſers of the

---

ſpeak. *Anna*, who was a Propheteſs *in the Temple, gave Thanks to the Lord, and ſpake of him to all them that looked for Redemption in* Iſrael: And I cannot tell how *Philip*'s Daughters propheſied, if they did not ſpeak in the Preſence of many. *Acts* xxi. 9.

the *Quakers* can vindicate their Practices, who all allow in ſome Sort or other that Practice, the Church of *England*, in making Reſponſes and all Diſſenters except *Quakers* in ſinging Pſalms, and returning Praiſe to God, all which is ſpeaking in the Church, and according to the Reviewer's Comment on the Apoſtle, a Shame, ſo that if it is an Error in the *Quakers* it is not ſo great an Error as in the others, for the *Quakers* permit but one to ſpeak at a time, but others, perhaps ſeveral Hundreds.

NEITHER can this Text deſtroy Women's propheſying preaching or praying in the Church, for the Word (Speak) in the Original, has a different Meaning to that of Propheſy, as * *Joſiah Martin* ſets forth, 'That it is ſpeaking raſhly and inconſiderately, and to ask Queſtions in the Church in the Time of divine Worſhip, to ſpeak inconſiderately

* Λαλεῖν to ſpeak, ſaith *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra*, is vulgarly taken in the bad Part, and ſignifies, *Temerè & inconſiderate verba fundere & effutiere.* Raſhly and inconſiderately to pour out Words which had been better kept in. And in this Senſe *Conſtantine* and *Capula*, Authors of the two beſt Greek Lexicons, have explained the Word λαλεῖν. They ſay 'tis commonly and for the moſt Part taken for raſh and inconſiderate Speaking, without any manner of Choice or Diſcretion. And is not asking of Queſtions in the Church in Time of Divine Worſhip, to ſpeak inconſiderately and without Diſcretion, and the very Thing which the Apoſtle ſaid was a Shame to Women? p. 235.

'ſiderately and without Diſcretion, and the very 'thing which the Apoſtle calls a Shame'. And this correſponds with what the Apoſtle ſays, * if they will learn any thing, let them ask their Huſbands

---

' * Why, I apply, ſays *Locke*, this Prohibition of Speaking only to Reaſoning and purely voluntary Diſcourſe, but ſuppoſe a Liberty left Women to ſpeak, where they had an immediate Impulſe and Revelation from the Spirit of God. vid. ch. xi. 3. In the Synagogue it was uſual for any Man, that had a Mind, to demand of the Teacher a farther Explication of what he ſaid: But this was not permitted to the Women.

' * St. *Paul*'s forbidding Women to ſpeak in the Aſſemblies, will probably ſeem a ſtrong Argument againſt this: But when well conſidered will perhaps prove none. There be two Places wherein the Apoſtle forbids Women to ſpeak in the Church, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 34, 35: and 1 *Tim.* ii. 11. 12. He that ſhall attentively compare theſe together, may obſerve that the Silence injoined the Woman, is for a Mark of their Subjection to the Male Sex: And therefore what in the one is expreſſed by *keeping Silence, and not ſpeaking, but being under Obedience.* In the other is called, *being in Silence with all Subjection, not teaching, nor uſurping Authority over the Man.* The Women in the Churches were not to aſſume the Perſonage of Doctors, or ſpeak there as Teachers; this carried with it the Appearance of Superiority, and was forbidden; nay, they were not ſo much as to ask Queſtions there, or to enter into any ſort of Conference. This ſhews a Kind of Equality, and was alſo forbidden: But yet, though they were not to ſpeak in the Church in their own Names, or as if they were raiſed by the Franchiſes of Chriſtianity, to ſuch an Equality with the Men, that where Knowledge or Preſumption of their own Abilities emboldened them to it, they might take upon them to be Teachers and Inſtructors of the Congrega-

' tion

bands at home, this directly points out, that it was over Officiousness to ask Questions, or prate improperly and unseasonably in the Church, but did not regard Prophesy when they were gifted

---

'tion, or might at least enter into Questionings and Debates 'there. This would have had too great an Air of Stand-'ing upon even Ground with the Men, and would not have 'well comported with the Subordination of the Sex. But 'yet this Subordation, which God for Orders Sake had 'instituted in the World, hinder'd not, but that by super-'natural Gifts of the Spirit, he might make Use of the *weaker 'Sex*, to any extraordinary Function whenever he thought 'fit, as well as he did of the Men. But yet, when they 'thus either prayed or prophesyed by the Motion and Im-'pulse of the Holy Ghost, Care was taken that whilst they 'were obeying God, who was pleas'd by his Spirit to set 'them a speaking, the Subjection of their Sex should not be 'forgotten, but owned and preserved by their being cover-'ed. The Christian Religion was not to give Offence by 'any Appearance or Suspicion that it took away the Sub-'ordination of the Sexes, and set the Women at Liberty 'from their natural Subjection to the Man. And therefore 'we see that in both these Cases, the Aim was to maintain 'and secure the confessed Superiority and Dominion of the 'Man, and not permit it to be invaded so much as 'in Appearance. Hence the Arguments in the one 'Case for Covering, and in the other for Silence; are all 'drawn from the natural Superiority of the Man, and the 'Subjection of the Woman. In the one the Woman, with-'out an extraordinary Call, was to keep silent, as a Mark 'of her Subjection: In the other, where she was to speak 'by an extraordinary Call and Commission from God, she 'was yet to continue the Profession of her Subjection in 'keeping herself covered. Here by the Way it is to be ob-'served, that there was extraordinary praying to God by 'the Impulse of the Spirit, as well as Speaking unto Men 'for their Edification; Exhortation and Comfort; Vid. Ch. 'xiv. 15. Rom. viii. 26. Jude ver. 20.

gifted of God for that Purpoſe; and this muſt be the more allowed when we find it agrees with the Propheſy of *Joel*, *I will pour out my Spirit upon all Fleſh, and your Sons and your Daughters ſhall Propheſy* *. This is an expreſs Declaration of God by the Mouth of the Prophet, which muſt be received for Truth, except we make *Joel* a falſe Prophet, and can it be ſuppoſed that the Apoſtle by ſaying *Let your Women keep Silence in the Church for it is not permitted unto them to ſpeak*, he did write in Oppoſition to this Declaration of the Almighty, and contradict the Order and Deſign of God, in pouring out the Spirit of Propheſy without Diſtinction of Male or Female. This cannot I ſay be ſuppoſed of the Apoſtle, he knew better what belonged to the Nature of the Goſpel Diſpenſation, and the Meaning of *Joel*'s Propheſy, and therefore could not intend what I have before mentioned to regard Propheſy or Praying, the former

* Dr. *Lowth* in his Comment on theſe Words, of *Joel*, *I will pour out my Spirit upon all Fleſh, and your Sons and your Daughters ſhall propheſy*, ſays, The Gift of Prophecy was beſtowed upon ſome Women under the Old Teſtament, as upon *Miriam* Exod. xv. 20. *Deborah*, Judg. iv. 14. and *Huldah*, 2 Kings xxii. 24. But this Gift was more frequently conferred upon them in the Times of the New. Thus we read of four Daughters of *Philip* the Evangeliſt, who did propheſy, *Acts* xxi. 9. And Church Hiſtory affords us ſeveral other Inſtances; ſuch as *Perpetua* and *Felicitas*, who were Martyrs for the Chriſtian Faith, *Potamiæna* mentioned by *Euſebius* and others.

former of which I apprehend to include preaching, or if any Difference the greater Gift, according to 1 *Cor.* xiv. 1, 2. For greater is he that propheſieth than he that ſpeaketh with Tongues.

It cannot be expected I ſhould write profeſſedly on this Subject in this Letter, eſpecially ſince it has extended to a greater Length than I expected, neither indeed is there any great Reaſon for it, there being divers Pieces extant which have been directly writ upon that Point, particularly * *Joſiah Martin*, before mentioned in his Appendix to the

M *Great*

* Now if by the original Word λαλεῖν *to ſpeak*, be underſtood unneceſſary and inconſiderate Speaking (and the Word is moſt commonly uſed in that Senſe by Greek Authors) then may the latter Words of the Apoſtle be very well reconciled with the former. And indeed the Context itſelf ſhews plain enough that it was unneceſſary and inconſiderate Speaking that the Apoſtle deſigned to prohibit, for ſays he, *if they will learn any thing let them ask their Husbands at Home.* It is evident by this, that it was not Preaching or Propheſying in the Church which the Apoſtle ſaid was a Shame to Women, but an inquiſite and troubleſome Speaking in Time of Worſhip. We therefore are of Opinion, that the Apoſtle's reprehending and enjoyning ſuch Women to keep Silence in the Churches, is no more a forbidding Women indued with the Gift of Propheſy, to exerciſe that Gift in the Church, than his reprehending Men for an unneceſſary and indiſcrete Uſe of the Gift of Tongues, is a forbidding them to exerciſe that Gift: For 'tis plain the Aim of the Apoſtle was, that all Things might be done orderly and without Confuſion in the Church, and with ſuch Counſel and Advice he cloſes that Part of his Epiſtle, wherein he ſets forth the Deſign and Uſe of ſpiritual Gifts.

Great Case of Tythes, wherein he hath shewn, that the *Quakers* are not alone in this Opinion, but has produced the Authority of so great a Man as *John Lock*, *Pool*'s Annotations, and divers of the ancient Fathers, some of which I have here produced and for the rest, I refer the Reader to the said Book.

The eighth Chapter is on silent Meetings. And it looks to me as if *W. N.* was averse to Silence, or he would not have brought this into his Catalogue of Errors. By silent Meetings I understand not a Meeting together, and sitting in an inactive State of Mind, for those who are thus circumstanced do not perform true Worship to Almighty God. Let there be or be not preaching, but that the Mind should come into true Retirement to God, contemplating and waiting upon him with deep inward Reverence and Prostration before him; in which such Retirement we are made to see our States and Conditions, and then to apply to him according as they are made to appear to us, and this is the true Manner to perform spiritual Worship, which our Lord spoke of, *The time is coming and now is, that they that worship the Father, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth.* And this is the true End and Design of the *Quakers* Meeting sometimes in Silence, for as it is the Business of every Member so to wait upon God, so it is likewise

Wise the Business of the Preacher, that by the preparing Grace of God, he may be fitly qualified to speak to the State of the Hearers, and so speak to their Comfort and Edification. But then it does not always fall out, that the Preacher however he may be favoured at other Times, that he may have any thing to deliver, except from what arises from his own Will, Study and Contrivance, and not from the real moving of the Spirit of Christ, and then it is his Place to sit in Silence; so that it is from a mistaken Opinion, that many Persons have derided this of silently waiting upon God, when it is the most direct Way to attain the End proposed by Meeting, namely, to worship God, and to obtain Strength and Comfort to the Soul, it is the most becoming our rational Nature, we are framed for Consideration and Contemplation with our Maker, and the more intense we are in that, the more we are becoming ourselves. And this sort of Solitude and Retirement is the most apt and fittest Means to conform the Soul to the Will of God, so that when People are met to worship God, and their Minds are rightly disposed to him, then it is that he is worshiped in Spirit, he stands not in need of any outward Performances, no vocal or instrumental Musick to have chanted out to him what may be called Praise or Thanksgivings. But he looks at the Heart, at the Frame and Disposition of the

Soul, and as that is he accepts or refuſes the Offering. Preaching is for the Benefit of the Hearers, to put them upon their Duty, and to raiſe fit and proper Deſires for Devotion; but Worſhip which concerns every individual, is an immediate Action of the Soul towards God, and therefore the *Quakers* aſſert, that an humble Waiting upon God for the Manifeſtation of his Spirit and Power in order to incline and draw to him, is the moſt acceptable to God, the moſt becoming ourſelves, and the true Way to attain the End propoſed.

R. B. hath excellently reaſoned upon this Subject, and ſhewn the fitneſs and conſiſtency with the ſpiritual Worſhip enjoin'd in the Goſpel, and ſupported it with divers Texts of Scripture, which are pertinent and concluſive in this Caſe, all which the Reviewer with his uſual air of Raſhneſs, calls *Knavery in* R. B. *and that he anſwers a Fool according to his Folly.* Language, that as he did not demerit, ſo it would not have been given him by any one who had a tolerable ſhare of Senſe or Manners. *R. B.* has referred to about thirty Places in Scriptures, which direct waiting upon God, and what very great and precious Promiſes are annexed, particularly *Iſa.* xl. 41. *They that wait upon God, ſhall renew their Strength.* But of theſe the Reviewer hath taken Notice but of two or three Places, the firſt is that of *Job* ii. 13. *So they ſat down*

with

with him upon the Ground, ſeven Days and ſeven Nights, and none ſpake a word unto him. This is one Text that *R. B.* brings to ſhew, that ſilent Meetings were not altogether Novel, for that we have ſuch an early Inſtance here cited, to which *W. N.* Objects, and to take away the Influence that this Text would have in this Caſe, he ſays, *Job's Friends did not come to Worſhip God, but to Comfort an afflicted Friend.* As appears V. 11. *They made an Agreement, both to Mourn with him, and Comfort him.* Here our Author has taken a Negative upon him, to prove that they did not come to worſhip God, which however eaſy he may think the Task, I apprehend it Difficult, and except he doth prove this, it is a very ſtrong Argument on *R. B's.* Side. There is ſufficient Reaſon to believe their Deſign was to worſhip God, as well as to *Viſit their afflicted Friend*, and that their Minds were, or ought to have beeen inwardly drawn to him, by which they might be made able to Comfort their afflicted Friend, for wherein could the Comfort conſiſt, ſince if there were no Communication by Words for ſeven Days, it would ſeem prepoſterous for Men to go to Viſit a Friend in Diſtreſs to Comfort him, if they were to ſit dumb for ſeven Days, and remain in an active State of Mind, with reſpect of any immediate Communication with God, by which each individual might find Comfort and ſo communicate it: beſides the Matter they went

about

about was to Visit a Friend in the utmost Distresses which God had been pleased to permit to come upon him, and therefore stood in need of some peculiar Council how to endure under those Afflictions; which Council could not have been equal to his Case, had it not proceeded from immediate Revelation; and consequently, they must wait upon God for that Revelation, at that time they sat in Silence, and this is confirmed by *Elihu*, *Job* xxii. 7, 8. *I said Days should speak, and multitude of Years should teach Wisdom, but there is a Spirit in Man, and the Inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.* Ver. 18. *For I am full of Matter, the Spirit within constraineth me.* So that from hence it appears, that the Friends of *Job*, either were or ought to have been in the time of Silence waiting upon God for the Inspiration of his Spirit, to be fitly qualified to speak to the State and Condition of *Job*; and this appears further by what follows in the 42 chap. Ver. 7, 9. In what the Lord said and Commanded to *Eliphaz*, *Bildad*, *and Zophar*.

But besides all this, one of the seven Days they sat in silence I suppose was the Sabbath, a Day of worship, and the Reviewer to maintain his Negative, must shew that the Friends of *Job*, if they did observe any Sabbath, did not worship God that Day, but that they dispensed with

with their Duty in that reſpect, to ſit dumb with an afflicted Friend.

THE next Text which the Reviewer objects to, is *Ezek.* xx. 2, 3, and 14. '*Then came the Word of the Lord to me ſaying, Son of Man ſpeak unto the Elders of Iſrael, and ſay unto them, thus ſaith the Lord God, are ye come to enquire of me, as I live ſaith the Lord God, I will not be enquired of by you.* This and chap. xiv. 3. which is much the ſame *W. N.* ſays, *But let it be obſerved, that theſe were only the Elders, but where will* Rob. Barclay *find a Scripture for the common People? I anſwer a Fool according to his folly.* However he ſeems to grant that the Elders did come, and then he is to ſhew that the common People were forbid, ſeeing the Obligation, are alike in the Duty of of worſhip. He adds, *There is one Expreſſion that makes us incline to grant that they might be Quakers,* pray obſerve the Tranſition. *For God told the Prophet, theſe Men have ſet up their Idols in their Heart, there you ſee that God had rejected them, and it is not to be admired that* R. B. *ſhould take them into the Number of* Quakers, *when God had rejected them.*

THAT's true indeed, this need not be wondred at, if *R. B.* was a Fool, as *W. N.* has aſſerted he was; but as a wiſe Man, he would hardly have taken

taken them into the Number of *Quakers*, for that very Reaſon, becauſe they were rejected of God: It would have been but an indifferent Addition, and not any Reputation, either to him or the *Quakers*, they have had more pretended to belong to them, than they have cared to own, who have brought no Reputation, either by their Practice or Writings, for which the Society have ſuffered in its Reputation, and have been called upon to vindicate thoſe Writings, when they have diſapproved them, as I have already ſhewn; but *R. B.* brought this Text to ſhew that it was the Cuſtom of the Elders of the People, to ſet before the Lord to enquire of him, and conſequently muſt ſet in Silence, to hear what the Lord would ſay to them; and as this was the Practice, and approved of God, it was not their being rejected at that Time, by reaſon of the Averſneſs of their Heart, that did diſſolve the mannerof their approaching before him; for if this was the Caſe, then, becauſe ſome Perſons, who go under a Pretence to worſhip God, though their Heart is averſe to him, that therefore the manner of Worſhip muſt be laid aſide.

To make an End of my Obſervations on this Chapter, I ſhall ſet down what *W. N.* further ſays on this matter, *Does his* (R. B's) *Religion need underhand dealings, for he was no Fool, he knew that theſe Texts could not prove any Part of Divine*

Worſhip

Worſhip at all, for theſe neither of them came to worſhip; but I leave him, I am not to be his Judge, nor he mine, Truth will ſtand by its ſelf; but no Lie is of the Truth, I ſhall ever ſuſpect that Religion that needs Falſhood to ſupport it. Here *W. N.* makes *R. B.* a ſtrange Sort of a Man; a Fool, and no Fool, in one Page he is a Fool, in another Page he is no Fool, which is a conſiſtency equal to our Reviewer; he aſſerts, that neither of the before mentioned came to worſhip God; the firſt in the Caſe of *Job*, I have already ſpoke to, and this I apprehend cannot be proved with reſpect to the laſt, for it will hardly be ſuppoſed, that the Elders would have gone to enquire of the Lord, and yet pay him no Adoration or Worſhip; this would have been peculiarly different to the general Practice, and a becoming Duty from Creatures to the Majeſty of Heaven.

The Reviewer has rightly obſerved, that no Lie is of the Truth, and if it be juſt (as it is according to him) to ſuſpect that Religion, that needs Falſhood to ſupport it: The Reader may judge what we muſt think of his Religion, from the many Inſtances taken Notice of in this Letter.

The ninth Chapter, *Is on not praying without the immediate ſenſible Impulſe of the Spirit*: In this Chapter, the Author has undertaken to ſhew that

we ought to pray (without this immediate Impulſe) though we do not know what to pray for, which though it may be called, Saying Prayers, yet it cannot be called Praying; for Praying is ſupplicating the Lord for ſomething, which we are ſenſible we want. *W. N.* ſays, *We own that Chriſtians, even the beſt of them, need the Help of the Spirit of God in Prayer, as the Spirit of Grace and of Supplication; we need the Aſſiſtance of it, to ſhew us our Wants, to warm our Affections, and to draw out the Heart to the Encreaſe of Grace. And that's the moſt acceptable and comfortable Prayer, wherein the Spirit of God does moſt intereſt himſelf; but it does not from hence follow, that it is not our Duty to pray, unleſs we enjoy the ſenſible Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God.* He aſſerts firſt, the Neceſſity of the Spirit of God, *to ſhew us our Wants, and to warm our Affections*, and yet we ought to pray, though we have not this Aſſiſtance: This I beg Leave to ſay, is Confuſion and Contradiction, and will continue to be ſo, unleſs he can ſhew how we can know our Wants, and pray acceptably without the Spirit; for then that would be in our own Spirits, without any real and true Knowledge of our Wants, which cannot be acceptable to God, to whom our Prayers and Praiſes are only acceptable, as they are offered to him in the Name (or Power) and Spirit of his Beloved Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whoſe ſenſible Impulſe we have need

to

to wait for, knowing of our ſelves, we cannot perform any Thing good or acceptable without it; however our Author has allowed this, That, *that is the moſt acceptable and comfortable Prayer, wherein the Spirit of God does moſt intereſt himſelf*; by this he allows, that there is an *Immediate ſenſible Impulſe of the Spirit*, in Order to Prayer, and this is what the *Quakers* aſſert; ſo that the only matter now remaining, is, (ſince we cannot know what to pray for without the Spirit) whether an Addreſs which may be called Prayer, which is without that Aſſiſtance, will meet with Acceptance, the Apoſtle, *Rom.* viii. 27. ſays, *we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it ſelf maketh Interceſſion for us with Groanings that cannot be uttered.* And this is the Prayer which is acceptable to God, though it be but a Sigh which is raiſed by his own Spirit; Words are uſeful in Prayer for the Hearers to join with him who prays, but God ſtands not in Need of Words, he knows the Frame of the Mind, and a Sigh or Groan is as intelligible to him as Words:

But, ſays our Author, pag. 43. *it may be worth while to enquire, whether there is not a ſecret Averſion in Heart to the Duty of Prayer; the reaſon of this Enquiry, is, becauſe few of the* Quakers *pray in their Families, as if there were no Family Sins to confeſs and ask Pardon for, no Family Mercies to pray*

for, or no Favours to offer Thanks for: But I deny this Charge, and call on him to prove it.

He has not gone about to make this Enquiry, he has by this only raiſed a Suggeſtion to to prejudice the Reader againſt them; but it is a Wonder he did not make this general, by leaving out the Word *few*, and ſaid all the *Quakers*: I do not apprehend, that he is made Privy to the private Circumſtances of the Families of the *Quakers*, to aſſert any ſuch Thing from his own Knowledge, neither would that determine the Caſe, ſuppoſing the few that he was acquainted with, was not often in the Practice of outward Prayer, that that Number he ſo knows, would include the whole or ſo much of the whole, as to make it a general Charge. But I apprehend, that not Praying, and pretending to pray without the Influence of the Spirit of God, are much the ſame; for as the one, the Reviewer calls a Neglect of Prayer, the other is praying for they know not what, without any Authority.

He ſays pag. 44. *We are bid to pray always, and pray without ceaſing*: Which as it cannot be underſtood of Family-Prayer, ſo neither of Vocal-Prayer; neither of them being practicable, *always*, and *without ceaſing*: But what I apprehend the Apoſtle means, is a conſtant Breathing of the

Soul to God, being kept under the Divine Influence of the Spirit, by which alone all Prayer, whether Mental or Vocal, is acceptable.

But the Reviewer, hath repreſented the *Quakers*, as if they lived without praying, either Mentally or Vocally; or elſe what did he bring this for, *Is he born from above, then he muſt breath towards Heaven*, Acts xix. 11. *Behold he prayeth.* This the *Quakers* aſſert as much as he, that it is an indiſpenſible Duty to pray to Almighty God, for the Continuance of his Mercies, and to praiſe him for what we have received; the Soul that is born from above will pray, and breath towards Heaven, but then it is in that Life and Spirit, by which it is born from above; it muſt not pray in the firſt Birth, in the firſt Nature and Spirit, for this cannot be acceptable; I draw this from *W. N*'s own Obſervation, *Born from above.*

The 10th Chapter is on *Inſpiration*, and the *Spirit of Prophecy*; and on this I need not ſpend much Time, for I apprehend, that *Inſpiration* and *Immediate Revelation* are the ſame, to which I have ſpoke already, in my Obſervations on the Chapter of the Light within; and whoever has the Gift of Propheſy by ſuch Inſpiration, no doubt

doubt is a true Prophet: But it is not every Perſon who lays claim to ſuch Inſpiration, that really has it, many have been in ſeveral Ages miſtaken about themſelves, their Zeal and Affection for Self has run too high, and has carried them into Imaginations, which they have taken for Divine Inſpiration; and hence have ariſen Miſtakes and Errors in this Reſpect; but it does not from thence follow, that becauſe ſome have given Proofs of their being miſtaken, and pretended to what they had not, that deſtroys the Reality of the Thing laid Claim to: Divine Inſpiration, is, or is not, ſeperate from Mens Pretences to it; if the Truth and Reality of a Thing was to be deſtroyed, or annull'd by the Evidences that Men give, then Religion muſt in a great Meaſure be deſtroyed; for there are but very few in compariſon of the whole, whoſe Practices tend to the Proof of the Chriſtian Religion; and yet it would be unjuſt, to pronounce that untrue, becauſe of that, or for Want of an equal Evidence. To this it may be anſwered, the Chriſtian Religion has an Evidence in it ſelf, ſeperate from Men's Practices which I grant, and ſo has Inſpiration, from the Authority of the ſame holy Records, which are an Evidence for the Chriſtian Religion, which I have before illuſtrated; ſo that thoſe Matters brought by the Reviewer, admit they were true, cannot diſprove

diſprove the Reality of divine Inſpiration; they only prove that the Men who pretended to thoſe Prophecies, were miſtaken: though at the ſame Time I do not grant the Truth of his Relations; but object to the Authority of the Author, who, I am ſorry to ſay, has given too many Proofs of his Inſincerity, to be believed in ſuch Caſes, on his own Credit; with Reſpect to *William Penn*, he is certainly defenſible, for that he, peculiar to his uſual Caution and Ingenuity, ſpoke with Reſpect to *Hicks* ſafely, there being a Condition expreſt, which was, 'If thou doſt not deſiſt, and 'come to Repentance.' Which I am credibly informed *Hicks* did deſiſt; and I conceive it impoſſible for *W. N.* to prove that he did not repent, notwithſtanding his raſh Aſſertion.

But the Reviewer, in this, as well as in divers other Chapters has miſrepreſented *G. F.* pag. 242. *George Fox* ſaith, *that the* Quakers *in general*, (pray obſerve, that he ſpeaks of it as a common Gift among that People) *are in the ſame Power, Underſtanding, and Knowledge, and immediate Revelation from Heaven, that the Apoſtles were in.*

And this I beg Leave to ſay, is untrue, for *G. F's* Words are theſe: 'They are in the ſame

'Power,

'Power, Underſtanding, Knowledge, and immediate Revelation from Heaven, that the Apoſtles were in, that underſtand the Goſpel, *Great Myſtery* page 242.' This is what *G. F.* ſaith, and there is not the Word *Quaker* in the whole Page, that I can ſee: He leaves it indefinite whoever they are that are in the ſame immediate Revelation as the Apoſtles were in, they underſtand the Goſpel.

I COME now to ſpeak to the two laſt Chapters, which are on *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*; both which I ſhall take Notice of together, becauſe they are maintained by the Reviewer on one Foundation, which, he ſays, are Commands of Chriſt.

I SHALL not ſay much on theſe Subjects, he having ſet me an Example; nor has he uſed any Arguments for the Support of what he has laid down, which are worth conſidering, but has proceeded with a dogmatical Air, which ſeems to be pretty much his Province.

THESE Subjects have been the Conteſt of many Ages, in which the Arguments on both Sides ſeem to be almoſt exhauſted; the Variety of Opinions and Practices in the ſeveral Churches, through various Times, is an Evidence of the former

mer, and the different Tracts and Volumes which have been writ on them, an Evidence of the latter; I need not mention the different Manners uſed in thoſe Times; ſome baptized the Living for the Dead, others baptized with Milk and Honey, another Sort baptized with a Burning Iron; and to this Day, there is a Difference among Proteſtants; the *Epiſcopalians*, baptize Infants; the *Baptiſts* only adult Perſons; and theſe, when conſidered rightly, can be no Evidence for Water-Baptiſm, in being a Command of Chriſt; for if that had been really ſo, and thence it became an incumbant Duty upon Chriſtians to perform that Command, he would certainly have directed who were to be the Subjects of Baptiſm, and likewiſe directed the manner of it.

And ſo with Reſpect to the *Supper*, R. B. ſays, pag. 454. 'The *Papiſts* ſay, the Subſtance of the 'Bread is tranſubſtantiated into the very Subſtance 'of that ſame Body, Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt. 'The *Lutherans* ſay, the Subſtance of the Bread 'remains, but that alſo, that the Body is in, and 'and with, and under the Bread; So that both 'the Subſtance of Bread and of the Body, Fleſh, 'and Blood of Chriſt is there alſo.

The *Calviniſts* deny both theſe, and affirm, that the Body of Chriſt is not there corporally,

'or ſubſtantially, but yet that it is really and Sa-
'cramentally received by the Faithful, in the Uſe
'of Bread and Wine; but how, or what way it's
'there, they know not, nor can they tell; only
'we muſt believe it is there; yet ſo, as that it is
'only properly in Heaven.' And alike different have been the manner of taking it; ſome ſitting, others ſtanding, and ſome kneeling; ſome in the Morning, others in the Evening.

AND all theſe are no Evidence of its being an expreſs Command of Chriſt, but rather ſhews it to be a continued Cuſtom of a *Jewiſh* Ceremony, which have ariſen from miſtaken Apprehenſions of the real Nature and Deſign of the Goſpel Diſpenſation.

BUT I would here enquire, what *Baptiſm* it was our Lord commanded; Water is not mentioned in the 28th of *Matthew*; and the word Baptize or Baptiſm, is a complex Word, we find it made uſe of in different Senſes in the Scripture; ſometimes regarding Water, other times Afflictions; and it is made uſe of with reſpect to the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt. So that as this is a complex Word, the Reviewer, to maintain that Chriſt commanded Water-Baptiſm, muſt ſhew, that the Word in that Text was made uſe of to regard Water.

JOHN

JOHN the Baptiſt, had a Baptiſm peculiar to his Diſpenſation, which is granted was Water: And there was a Baptiſm of Chriſt's, which was peculiar to his Diſpenſation according to *Mat.* iii. 11. *He ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and Fire*; theſe were two diſtinct Baptiſms, in Order of time and Nature; and the Queſtion will turn, which of theſe Baptiſms muſt we conclude our Lord commanded? To ſay, he commanded Water-Baptiſm, which was *John's*, would have been to prefer *John's* Diſpenſation and Baptiſm before his own. The Apoſtle will help to ſolve this Matter, *Eph.* iv. 5. *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptiſm*; now as there was a Baptiſm of Chriſt, which was that of the Holy Ghoſt, it is to be concluded, that the Apoſtle regarded this Baptiſm, when he ſaid, there was *One*; becauſe he was an Apoſtle of our Lord, and conſequently, had he intended *John's* Baptiſm, it would have been preferring *John* before Chriſt; ſo that the Queſtion now is, which Baptiſm our Lord commanded, according to what the Apoſtle ſays, there is *One Baptiſm*, which he brings upon a Parity with *One Lord, One Faith*, ſo that as there is but one Lord, and one Faith, there is but one Baptiſm; which, for the Reaſons before mentioned, muſt be underſtood the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, which is Chriſt's, and conſequently he commanded his own.

I KNOW it has been aſſerted, to evade the Force and Concluſiveneſs of this of the Apoſtle, that the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt and Water, make but one Baptiſm: To which I anſwer, That to prove this to be ſo, it muſt be ſhewn, that they are never diſtinct, but that the Holy Ghoſt is always concomitant with the Adminiſtration of Water, which I think ſo difficult a Taſk, no Man in his Senſes will undertake; for that, if they are at any time diſtinct, they cannot be one entire Baptiſm. When our Author has anſwered theſe Premiſes, and brought forth ſomething more worthy of Note on this Head, I may proceed further.

THE *Supper* is maintained on this Bottom, *This do in Remembrance of me.* Can a Man, with any tolerable Reaſon aſſert this Direction to our Lord's then Followers, to be a Command of perpetual Obligation on the ſucceeding Ages? had he ſo deſigned it, he would no doubt have eſtabliſhed it with an Authority equal to the Importance of it. But this * *R. B.* hath excellently diſcours'd on, and I intreat the Reader to read him impartially, and then I doubt not of his receiving Satisfaction in this Point.

OUR

* See his *Apology*, pag. 403.

Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt came to eſtabliſh a Diſpenſation different from the former, which conſiſted in divers outward Rites and Ceremonies enjoined on thoſe People as their Duty; But this Diſpenſation conſiſted more immediately in the ſpiritual and moral Nature of Men's Obligations to their Maker; and it would ſeem unreaſonable, that Jeſus Chriſt, who by his Coming, did aboliſh the Law of Ceremonies, and came to eſtabliſh a Religion upon the moral Reaſon of Men's Obligations to God; and Man ſhould inſtitute other Ceremonies in the room of thoſe he had aboliſhed, which had no more intrinſick Worth, nor no more related to the Nature of ſuch Obligations, than thoſe very Ceremonies he had aboliſhed; this cannot be ſuppoſed of the Bleſſed Jeſus, who would not have acted ſo inconſiſtently: But all the Laws he gave, and the Example he ſhew'd, were ſtrictly conſiſtent with the Religion he deſigned to eſtabliſh; a Religion, which ſtood in Conformity of the Mind, and Subjection of the Will to the Great Creator; a Religion, which taught ſtrictly the Obligations we have one to another, and as ſtrictly enjoyned the Performance.

The Contenders therefore for Water-Baptiſm and the Supper, when they urge them as Commands of Chriſt, muſt ſhew, that they are extrinſick

ſick of the Nature of the Goſpel Diſpenſation; for whatſoever is not adequate to the Reaſon and Deſign of a Thing propos'd to be done, nor cannot intrinſically contribute thereto, that muſt be extrinſick of the Thing deſigned; the Deſign of the Diſpenſation of Chriſt, was, and is to reform the Mind of Man, to change his averſe Affections and Will, and to raiſe Deſires and Affections after the ways of Virtue, and the Performance of the Laws of God; in ſhort, becoming ſubject to his Will, taking the Yoke of Chriſt upon him. Now whatſoever is not adequate to thoſe Purpoſes of the Goſpel, muſt be extrinſick of the Nature and Deſign of it, and from hence I conclude, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who was perfect Wiſdom, would not have commanded any Thing (as Water, and Bread and Wine) as intrinſick of the Goſpel, which was really otherwiſe.

If any ſhould return and ſay, That the ſeveral Ceremonies under the Law, were as extrinſick of the real Deſign of the moral Nature of Men's Obligations, as theſe which are called poſitive Inſtitutions, and which would have been as inconſiſtent to have eſtabliſhed as theſe:

To which I anſwer, That I regard the Deſign of the Diſpenſation, and what Laws are impoſed in that Diſpenſation; the Ceremonies enjoyned were

in

in Conſequence of Laws given to the Children of *Iſrael*; it was an outward Diſpenſation, and therefore outward Performances which were done in Conſequence of thoſe Laws, and ſo were not extrinſick of the Nature of that Diſpenſation; but the Diſpenſation of Chriſt, is a ſpiritual and moral one, and conſequently outward Ceremonies are extrinſick of a ſpiritual Religion.

To conclude, I have conſidered the Reviewer with Impartiality, and I muſt obſerve, that there is too much Reaſon to believe it to be an ill-natured malicious Performance, and done without Order or due Method. I have taken Notice of the moſt material Parts, and thoſe which regard Quotations from the ſeveral Authors the Reviewer has mentioned, to whom he has been exceeding unjuſt, in declaring to the World, that for their Principles, which are not ſo; and which I thought my ſelf more immediately concern'd to take Notice of, and reſcue from his Abuſe. There is ſcarce one Sentence but I might have writ ſomething on, I conſidered that would make a large Volume, and therefore endeavoured to be as conciſe as I could; but if he ſhall think I have not been equal in the Anſwer, let him tell the World wherein; and do it like a Diſputant, and I ſhall endeavour to give Satisfaction. On the contrary, if he ſhould proceed in the ſame immethodical manner, as in this, my Time will

will not permit me to anſwer him; neither had I now, but for the ſake of ſome People who may be hurt with reſpect to their good Opinion of the *Quakers*, by his Miſrepreſentation of them.

He has indeed in Page 55. ſpoke in Commendation of them, That they are *Good Subjects, to the King, peaceable Neighbours, ſober and free from open Vices, and may be ſet for Examples to Thouſands.* This is a Reputation I am heartily glad they have obtained; and I the more believe it, becauſe if the Reviewer could have collected any Thing againſt them from the Inſtances he has given, he would not have ſpared to have publiſhed them. But I cannot conceive how he can make ſo ſolemn *an Appeal, that he hath not perform'd this Service out of any Prejudice.* What Credit can be given to him, when his Performance is founded on little elſe but falſhoods? he hath exceeded in the Quotations he hath produc'd, more than a Man who can make that ſolemn Appeal, could or would have done; and even in this very Place, (notwithſtanding he has commended and ſet them for an Example to Thouſands) he ſuppoſes, that their Soberity and Virtue does not ariſe from Chriſtian Principles, and ſo muſt act without any ſuch. And here it will become neceſſary for him to ſet forth what is the Reaſon or Cauſe of their ſo behaving, as to become Examples to

Thouſands

Thousands, I suppose he means (Christians) what sort of Christians, (says he) *must we esteem such to be, who hardly hold one Article of the Christian Faith, who slight the Word of Christ, and the preaching of it, who deny the Person, the human Nature and Offices of Christ, who Trust not in his Death and Merits for Salvation; that utterly reject the Sabbath and Ordinances of Christ, that teach Men to patch up a Righteousness of their own doings, and to build upon the Covenant of works, and not upon the Covenant of Grace, that teach men to mind no more of the Scriptures, than they Experience within themselves.* He may well ask what *sort of Christians* such must be? But can he sincerely *appeal to the searcher of Hearts*, that he has no Prejudice against the *Quakers*, when he has published these Things as their Principles, which if he ever read their Writings, he must know are untrue. And I here declare it, not only as my own belief, but that of the Christian Society in contempt called *Quakers*.

That we do not deny any one *Article of the Christian Faith*, as recorded in the holy Scriptures: We *do not slight the preaching of Christ*, but esteem it a great Blessing of the Gracious and Beneficent Being, that he is pleased to favour us with a Ministry of the Gospel of Life and Salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ. We do not deny *the Human Nature of Christ*, but believe that as he

is really God, ſo we believe he was truely Man, conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, and born of the Virgin *Mary*, and that he died for the Redemption of Mankind, by whoſe Mediation and Interceſſion, Men are reconciled to God, and by virtue of *the Holy* Spirit working Redemption in the Soul, we truly come to reap the Benefit of his Death and Merits in order to our Salvation; We do not *utterly reject a Sabbath*, (or Day of Reſt) but plead it expedient there ſhould be one Day in Seven, a Day of Reſt, and that People ſhould go to the Publick Worſhip of God, We do not deny any of the Ordinances of Chriſt, but object Water-baptiſm, and the outward Practice of Bread and Wine to be Ordinances of Chriſt, We do not *teach Men to patch up a Righteouſneſs of their own*, but aſſert all *our own Righteouſneſſes are as filthy Rags*; and that the Righteouſneſs which Chriſtians are to be cloathed with, is the Righteouſneſs of God by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt. We do not *build on the Covenant of Works*, for by the Law, (by which I underſtand the Covenant of Works) No *Fleſh* ſhall be juſtified, and that *it is by Grace that we are ſaved through Faith, and that not of ourſelves, it is the Gift of God.* We believe the Scriptures in as full and extenſive a Senſe as any other Chriſtians, ſave only that we object to their being the Primary and *only Rule of Faith and Practice*, and the *Word of God*, for the

the Reasons before observed: We believe in a full manner the *History of the Bible*, the Excellent Account of *Creation and Providence* and all the *Prophecies and Promises* recorded in the Bible; *the Birth, the Life, the Death, Resurrection, Ascension and Glorification, of Jesus Christ*, and the *Last Judgment, Rewards and Punishments, Heaven and Hell.* All these Doctrines which the Reviewer asserts, and Insinuates we deny, we fully and sincerely own, as they are contained in the sacred Writings; and therefore, what must his Treatment of the *Quakers* in this Manner be attributed to, if not Prejudice? it must be a profound Ignorance of their Principles, and too great a dependance on the Credit of their Enemies: Let it be which way it will, he has given sufficient Proof of being an unfair Adversary, and instead of impartially Reviewing R. B. and the *Quakers* Principles, he has most partially abused them.

I am thy Friend,

H. B.

ERRATA.

Page 5. l. 25. transpose to put it after Wrote. p. 6. l. 31. Regards read Regard. p. 10. l. 6. Dispotant r. a Dispocant. p. 22. l. 5. r. Confident. p. 27. l. 25. for indivdual r. individual. p. 31. line 9. Scripture r. Scriptures. p. 38. l. 21. after the r. Principal. ditto l. 22. for Tooth r. Faith. p. 41. l. 11. for to r. too. p. 43. l. 23. after they r. been. p. 48. l. 29. for for r. too. p. 54. l. 4. for Bestially r. Beastially. p 56. l. 14 attached r. attached. p. 61. l. 22. for Authors r. Author. p. 63. l. 23. Scripture r. Scriptures. p. 64 l. 10. dele the and r. internal Manifestation. p. 71. l. 27. for gave A. S. r. given A. S. p. 79. l. 21. Seed r. Soul. p. 80. l. 2. after had r. not. p. 82. l. 4. for and that r. and they that. p. 93. l. 26. for active r. inactive. p. 94. l. 16 r. Obligations. p. 105. l. 22. dele in. p. 109 l. 11. dele the ; as God and put it after Man, ditto l. 24. have r. owe.